

UNIVERSITY  
OF MICHIGAN

FEB 20 1951

PERIODICAL  
READING ROOM

A.P.

# THE LONDON QUARTERLY AND HOLBORN REVIEW

EDITOR: LESLIE F. CHURCH, B.A., Ph.D.

**JANUARY 1951**

Price 4s.

## CONTENTS

**EDITORIAL COMMENTS**, by Leslie F. Church, B.A., Ph.D.

### **ARTICLES**

*The Coming Great Church*, Henry Pitney van Dusen

*The Mystery of the Holy Trinity*, Norman Adcock

*The Realm of Faith*, G. H. Findlay, M.A.

*The Great Lie of Communism*, D. R. Davies

*The Humanity of Iden Philipotts*, Cartwright Timms

*The Importance of Faith in Healing*, C. Edward Barker

*American Methodists and Other Churches*, William Warren Sweet, Ph.D.

*The Administration of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper in the Methodist Church after the Death of John Wesley*, Norman W. Mumford, M.A.

### **NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS**

*Remarks on the Origin of Life*, Richard Pyke

*The Chess-Board of Life*, Benjamin Richards

*Poetry as a Human Document*, Thomas H. Carter

*Kingwood Reformatory School, 1852-71*, J. Arthur Moyles

**RECENT LITERATURE**, Edited by C. Ryder Smith, B.A., D.D.

**FROM MY NEW SHELF**, C. Ryder Smith, B.A., D.D.

**OUR CONTRIBUTORS**

LONDON  
THE EPWORTH PRESS  
FRANK · H · CUMBERS

25 · 35 · CITY ROAD · E.C.1

---

---

# The London Quarterly and Holborn Review

LITERATURE      HISTORY      SOCIOLOGY  
RELIGION      THEOLOGY      PHILOSOPHY

*Editor:* LESLIE F. CHURCH, B.A., Ph.D.

*The London Quarterly and Holborn Review* is published on the 25th of March, June, September, and December by the Epworth Press, 25-35 City Road, London, E.C.1. It may be obtained from the publishers or any bookseller at 4s. a copy (postage 3d.) or 15s. per annum, post free.

All contributions (typewritten, if possible), should be addressed to The Editor, 'The London Quarterly and Holborn Review', 25-35 City Road, E.C.1, with stamped addressed envelope for return in case of non-acceptance.

---

---

## *Give Youth its Chance*

For eighty-two years the National Children's Home has been giving to destitute and orphaned girls and boys the chance which is the right of every child. Over 85,000 children have passed through its doors to a new and better life.

Despite all the State is doing, the work of the National Children's Home is still necessary, and an urgent appeal is made for continued support.

---

*Legacies are specially solicited*

---

## NATIONAL CHILDREN'S HOME

Chief Offices: HIGHBURY PARK, LONDON, N.5.



th  
p  
th  
c  
B  
a  
S  
a  
k  
o  
o  
st  
o

cl  
a  
G  
h  
se  
th  
o  
n  
en  
'm  
Jo

an  
fo  
wl  
sa  
co  
pr  
cl  
bi  
'th  
an  
an  
ag  
th  
res

Dr  
It  
La  
co  
Za



# Editorial Comments

## A GREEK MANIFESTO

THE sufferings of the Greek people during the past few years have not yet been fully realized by the rest of the world. Their desperate resistance to powerful invading armies was offered at enormous cost but it was not only their young men who paid the price. Hunger and disease affected the whole population and, most tragic of all, at least 25,000 of their children were torn from their homes and families to be taken to unknown destinations from which no news came. It is not the first time such a crime has been committed against the Balkan peoples. Three centuries ago the Turkish invaders made a wholesale abduction part of a deliberate policy. Boys taken across the frontier from Serbia were trained under military supervision to become *yani chari*, mercenaries who fought in the Turkish armies, even against their own unrecognized kinsmen. There are, today, thousands of Greek mothers who have little hope of ever seeing their children again, yet know that they may be alive, unconscious of their identity and relationship, growing into manhood and womanhood in a strange land. It is difficult for more privileged people to understand the agony of Greece.

Under such circumstances it is the more remarkable that a clear Christian challenge should be offered by the Greeks to this self-tormented world. In 1946 a manifesto was published by the 'Christian Union of Professional Men of Greece' declaring their Christian belief. This affirmation was confirmed by two hundred Greek scientists in an addendum. In all, more than 1,200 men representing the keenest minds in the professional, commercial, and scientific life of the whole country have declared that their 'happiness (or unhappiness) depends on whether the Christian spiritual foundation of life is going to be stabilized or not, whatever the issue of the external political events may be'. The manifesto ended with the assurance that it was not the voice of despair, crying out '*morituri te salutamus*' but rather a voice echoing the truth of the words in John 8<sup>51</sup>: 'If a man keep my saying, he shall never see death.'

'The future of mankind depends first and foremost upon the laying of true and unshakable spiritual foundations for the life of contemporary man. Such a foundation cannot be laid if the man of today fails to use that treasure of values which Christianity, the Christian faith and Christian ethics hold out to him,' said the scientists, declaring that the 'estrangement from Christian values is contrary to the conclusions of truly unprejudiced critical research into the great problems which are fundamental to men; and more especially, to the conclusions being reached by contemporary scientific research.' In physics and biology, as in other sciences, they maintain that modern research shows that 'the attempt to make it appear that science belies Christian faith is without any scientific support'. Further, these representative men repudiate indignantly any attempt 'to employ the name and prestige of science to support attacks against the Christian faith'. Recognizing that the moral imperative is based on the Christian faith, they maintain that education must fail unless it include 'full respect toward Christian values'.

The manifesto and addendum published in 1946 has been followed by a Draft issued by the same people under the title *Towards a Christian Civilization*. It consists of lectures delivered by A. N. Tsirintanes, Professor in the Faculty of Law in the University of Athens. The substance of the book originated in the continuing deliberations of the Christian Union, the Theological Brotherhood *Zoe* and a number of other Christian societies. Its reception by the Greek people

was most encouraging and warranted the conclusion that it is an expression of the thoughts of a considerable portion of the whole population, including both rank and file and spiritual leaders. (Incidentally, it would repay many men like Mr. Fred Hoyle to read such a book carefully so that they might avoid coming to foolish, uninformed conclusions on fundamental Christianity—conclusions based on utterly inadequate information. There *are* men, whose work gives them the right to respectful hearing who whilst they 'no longer give credence to obsolete views on the relation of science to the Christian faith and to Christian ethics' believe that faith to be 'in complete harmony with the conclusions of modern science'.)

That such a book comes from Athens, the cradle of our civilization, is in itself interesting. Its 267 pages are modestly described as a Draft, but they contain a shrewd analysis of the major problems that face our world today. They bring to these problems a carefully considered application of the teaching of the New Testament, and they bring to their task critical faculties, spiritual insight and good humour. No reader could question their sense of urgency nor their confident faith, and though they admit no compromise with a secularized society, they are never guilty of crude denunciations or gallery-play.

The first section of the 'Draft' deals with general principles. The present situation seems to be divorced from normal history—the direct consequence of a madness that appears 'loose and inexplicable', but that has, in fact, a very real cause. The spiritual foundation of twentieth-century civilization is negative. The materialism of Feuerbach in 1848 was 'a consistent and direct negation of spiritual values'. Though, today, the negation is often indirect, it nevertheless undermines our spiritual foundations. We imagine technical progress is self-sufficient, but 'the more technical civilization advances, the more it has need of a spiritual foundation'. Education if it be but the acquisition of knowledge—and, in particular, technical knowledge—will not solve the fundamental problems. Neither, say these modern men of Athens, will the ancient philosophies! Nero was tutored by Seneca, and Alcibiades was one of the most famous of Socrates' pupils but the results were not flattering to the teachers.

Today there are countries where the crucifixes have been torn from the walls of the schools and thrown into the dust-cart; in students' conference camps Christian teaching has been forbidden; any compromise is accepted so long as it involves the negation of Christian values. This is having a disastrous effect on child-life and may easily produce a completely godless generation. Nor is the situation less tragic in so far as it is making womanhood subservient to a negative view of life. Even the grave has no hint of eternity or even hope! Negation, however, cannot survive without some sense of the mysteries—and this is, in places, being kept alive in the laboratories. This, says Professor Tsirintanes, leads to a climax when negation becomes negative even for itself. 'When negation becomes a state, or condition, we have logically a contradiction, and culturally an impossibility.'

What is needed today is a new stability, and this is only to be obtained by the determination to rebuild our civilization on Christian, spiritual foundations. The application of Christian principles to our modern life is, surely, the only way to that spiritual equilibrium which we call peace.

In a searching examination of our present Christian experience the Christian Union of Athens condemns professionalism and barren theology which leave out Christ the Leader. Though we have more knowledge of the content of Christianity than had the early Christians we have less knowledge of its power. The ancient world had its dream of the 'fine and good man' (ἀνὴρ καλός

καγαθός), but the Christian has the power and the command to change a mere dream into reality. To widen the gap between clergy and laity is no more the way to this transformation than is the withdrawal of the Christian from the market-place to the hermit's cell. He must attend to his social responsibilities and learn to place this earthly life 'within eternity'.

Living Christianity means, to these men of the manifesto, not something but everything. It exalts everything, they boldly say, 'from prayer to football'. It is the voice of eternity. It elevates without smothering. It is neither a steam-roller nor a mechanical equation, but 'a unity which sanctifies, co-ordinates, harmonizes but does not kill variety'.

In the attempt to apply Christianity to modern life, theology must not only present the faith, but in doing so must understand the new pathology of the soul and 'the form in which sin appears in modern society'.

The second part of this comprehensive survey deals with special applications and is too detailed to be described in full. The Christian estimate of man shows respect for all human personality. 'Christianity does not love only ideal men.' It is concerned with all mankind, and must seek to produce 'the fine and good man' from even the poorest material, showing plainly that irresponsibility is not freedom as is so often maintained. Christian liberty makes it possible for man to bind himself to the building of the City of God.

To this perplexed but sometimes arrogant world the Christian must be a man of the highest integrity, yet making a 'success' of his life in the deepest sense. His poise and power, coming from his unswerving faith, should help him to rejoice, even in adversity. He is in the truest sense 'a powerful man' because he has access to the divine resources. His heroism is the inevitable product of his spiritual health; his confidence based on the knowledge that he is a co-labourer with God; his ambition is not suppressed but dedicated to his Master.

In considering the sex problems, Dr. Tsirintanes voices the conclusion of the groups he represents: 'The procreation of descendants is understood as a creation connected with the guarantees which marriage and family can furnish. . . . This creation, which a natural sex life provides for, can be accomplished only within the family, i.e. in marriage.' A plea is made for the economic assistance of young men so that they can marry at a reasonably early age.

In educational matters an appeal is made for teachers who will respect the Christian faith and treat their pupils as spiritual beings in process of growth. Some of the factors which may shape personality are the family, the Church, the school, and society as a whole. The first three function more successfully when the social environment is part of a really Christian civilization. In short, both school and university are held to be much more than institutions for the imparting of knowledge; they are spiritual laboratories and should be staffed by teachers respecting the Christian faith and having themselves a sense of the spiritual nature of their vocation.,

Assessing the values of civilization, religion is declared to be of first importance. Christian faith, with Christian love, is the pre-eminent Christian value and, as a cultural value, is a focal point of right human relationships. Again, the Christian view of human personality differs from that of the ancient world and of all non-Christian philosophies in that it insists on its being respected apart from its usefulness or strength. (The story of the penitent thief recounts the Christian's joy at his salvation, though he was already past being able to render any service. There is, thus, no possible trace of expediency in the implied value-judgement. The implication of the Christian attitude to the sick,

the weak, the infant, the embryo, the sinner, or even the criminal is obvious and unique!) Prayer and worship, the study of the Bible, and the Christian man himself are of immense importance to civilization as a whole.

The downfall of materialism is definitely asserted by biologists like Driesch and by most eminent physicists, and science, 'serving in the field of truth, within the limits of its competence, is already, *ipso facto*, a general factor of Christian civilization'. It must resist the temptation to be used for 'negative metaphysics'. If the scientist is concerned, as a scientist, with affirming the difference between truth and falsehood, the Christian is concerned with making plain the difference between good and evil. The two are surely bound to work harmoniously together in the founding of a true and good (i.e. Christian) civilization.

In the same way, art must be accounted of real value. Artistic creation should never be destructive of other civilizing values, nor should it pander to man's lower instincts.

A right understanding of history and of tradition is equally important. He who eliminates human responsibility and relies on a mechanistic, blind necessity in his interpretation of the past robs it of its value. Today it is obvious that the present collapse is 'in direct opposition to the abilities of men'. Evil cannot work any good, in spite of the implications of Marxism. Our Lord asserted this with His terse comment: 'A corrupt tree cannot bring forth good fruit.'

Even in the sphere of economics it is clear that production depends on the human factor and so on the spiritual integrity of the worker. In elaborating this principle Professor Tsirintanes writes: 'Within a Christian civilization technical progress may create problems but not a "crisis". Far less will it create the agony and the despair one may see where mechanistic civilization exists.'

A further important value is to be found in the family which is a unity, with a common life in 'harmonized inequality'. Here again the Christian sense of the sacredness of personality sustains family life with this complete inequality. In this study of the family we find ourselves in general agreement, believing that economic assistance might be granted, under certain conditions, to young people establishing their home. Whilst there is something to be said for the temporary authority of the stronger there is at least as much to be argued for the rights of the weaker. At one point we would go farther than the professor who says that the illegitimate child ought, *as a rule*, to be protected, for we cannot conceive of a circumstance in which he has not such a right.

The concluding words of this lengthy consideration of the values of civilization are as follows: 'Desires for international peace which do not comprehend a stage of international justice, for the sake of which we must all agree to make sacrifices, are dreams which simply prevent the defence of the wronged, and secure tolerance of the unjust. Dreams like these are nothing less than a participation in international crime.'

The final study in what is a remarkable survey deals with the Social Problem. After a frank appraisal of the capitalist and socialist positions, the conclusion is reached that 'Christianity is not, and cannot be, a kind of socialism. But socialism can exist only within Christian spiritual surroundings. That is why any socialist experiment, carried out without or against Christianity is doomed to inevitable failure.' Pursuing the question in closer detail, the Draft considers the problems of Work, of Wages, of Property and of the position of the State. 'Work should not have the character of a strife for daily bread, but that of a mission connected with man's spiritual satisfaction.' 'More productive

output should be accompanied by a distribution based on the elements of justice.'

In the closing pages it is made quite clear that the writer and those he represents have no political ambitions. They are concerned solely with the spread of Christian principles among the Greek people and, indeed, over all the world. It would be possible to criticize the document at various points, but it stands as a remarkable witness to the existence of an informed and, dare we say, inspired body of Christian men in a country with proud traditions and grievous wounds.

'Mankind has to choose between Christ and destruction. . . . It calls for Deliverance. . . . It calls for the Saviour. . . . Mankind has seen and tried and had enough of negation and revolt, ruin and desolation. Now is the time for mankind to see Faith, life, power, creation, joy. Now is the time to feel all Christians at work for a Christian civilization!'

These are not the words of an impassioned evangelist—or are they? These twelve hundred men of Athens have answered the question in their manifesto and in this brave and challenging book.<sup>1</sup>

### THE DUTCH REFORMED CHURCH IN LONDON (1550-1950)

A LITTLE-KNOWN chapter in the history of religious exiles has come to light with the publication of Professor Lindeboom's *Austin Friars*. It was fitting that this fascinating and critical study should be completed for the four hundredth celebration of the founding of the London Community of Dutch refugees and that it should be written by the Professor of Church History in the University of Groningen. Other books available in English are *The marriage, baptismal and burial Registers, 1571-1874*, and *Monumental Inscriptions of the Dutch Reformed Church, Austin Friars, London*, by W. J. C. Moens, Lymington, 1884, and *The History of the French, Walloon, Dutch and other Foreign Protestant Refugees, settled in England, from the reign of Henry VIII to the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes*, etc., by John Southerden Burn, London, 1846. There is also a reprint from the *Journal of the British Archaeological Association* (March and June 1912) of an article by W. A. Cater entitled *The Priory of Austin Friars, 1253-1538*. Neither these authors nor the numerous Dutch works on the subject have revealed the pathos and romance of the early days of the community—still less its importance through the centuries. At times it has been the very centre of national hopes and in the recent years a refuge for the Queen and her Cabinet driven from Holland by the invaders. This recent research has given us a complete picture.

The relation between France, the Low Countries and England has always been close for there is a sense, as Dr. Lindeboom points out, in which the sea has been an easier highway than the land. In 1544 religious persecution was becoming more intense and the flow of refugees from the Continent to England increased. The King, Henry VIII, was not enamoured of Protestants as such, but he was a shrewd man of affairs. He saw the commercial value of these Dutch and Flemish craftsmen and so allowed them asylum—not because of their religious convictions but for their economic importance. Though the refugees did not at first have unlimited freedom in matters of religion, they found themselves amongst a people whose sympathies were with them, and who were importing, from Antwerp, many English editions of Reformation writings.

<sup>1</sup> *Towards a Christian Civilization: A Draft issued by the Christian Union of Professional Men of Greece*. A. N. Tsirintanes, Professor in the Faculty of Law, University of Athens. Published by Damascus Publications, 14 Karytsi St., Athens (1), Greece. Price 21s. or cloth-bound, 30s.



On the accession of Edward VI the situation improved and under the direction of Somerset the Regent and Cranmer the Archbishop of Canterbury, Petrus Martyr Vermiglio and Martin Bucer were given professorships at Oxford and Cambridge. They were invited, with other Continental theologians, to help in the revision of doctrine and ecclesiastical discipline.

Mixed as were the motives, the welcome accorded to the people of the Low Countries had the happiest results. English industries were developed by people who were experts in making gloves, leather goods, hats, pins and textiles. Many of them were excellent market-gardeners, others dyers, and some were experienced in land reclamation and drainage.

In 1550 a Polish nobleman, Johannes à Lasco came to settle in London. Influenced by Erasmus, he had given up a promising ecclesiastical-political career and taken refuge in East Friesland. Thence he came, at Cranmer's request in 1548, to Lambeth Palace where he advised the Archbishop in the shaping of the constitution of the English Church. After a brief return to Friesland he came finally to London when he was at once recognized as leader of all the refugees—Dutch, French, Italian, and Spanish. It was decided to establish a German Church. The actual phrase is '*ecclesia germana*' and the word German was in common use to describe the people of the Northern Netherlands, Brabant, Flanders and all who spoke the Low German tongue. In the spring of 1550 the King, at the request of the Duchess of Suffolk and Francisco Berti, offered the church originally used by the Augustine Friars, to Maarten Micron and Wouter Delenus the pastors of the Dutch Community. The Charter was completed on 24th July 1550. There is an entry in the young King's diary, dated 29th June, which reads: 'It was appointed that the Germans should have the Austin Friars for their Church to have their service and for avoiding of all sects of Anabaptists and such like.'

The best comment on the Charter itself was made by Jan Utenhove, who had been compelled to flee from Ghent because of his religious views. He was a graduate of Louvain, Zwinglian rather than Lutheran in his outlook, and coming to London in 1549, for the second time, he became one of the first elders of the Dutch congregation. Writing to Calvin he expressed his pleasure at the conditions of the Charter since it provided for the proclamation of 'the unadulterated Word' and the exercise of Church discipline. 'Further, and for this we had not asked, we have nothing to do with the Bishops, not even the Bishop of London.' This freedom apparently annoyed the Bishops as much as it pleased Jan Utenhove. Four ministers were appointed—two for the Walloons and two for the Dutch, and à Lasco was made Superintendent over both sections. The two little communities were Presbyterian in their constitution with ministers, elders, and deacons designated by the members of the congregation, as with the Reformed Churches on the Continent. This was in marked contrast to the Anglican episcopacy. The terms were generous and wisely so, for though Calvinists and Lutherans could be gladly welcomed, there were fanatical and revolutionary spirits, resenting all discipline—the 'Täufer', the Anabaptists and others—whose presence would have been a menace. The establishment of this disciplined Community, with its strong Protestant principles was a boon to the King and his advisers. It became at once a little stronghold of the Protestant faith, helping to overcome the last surviving elements of Roman influence.

Soon after the Charter was granted the French congregation was offered the chapel of St. Anthony Hospital in Threadneedle Street. This left Austin Friars (the Temple of Jesus, as it was called, because of an inscription in one of the

windows) entirely for the Dutch. From 1550 until its destruction by a landmine in 1940, it was the spiritual home of all Dutchmen living in London.

The Church itself was built by Humphrey de Bohun, for the Augustine (mendicant) Friars, on his return from the Crusade in 1253. It was reconstructed in 1354, and was of noble proportions, with a spire to which Stow referred in 1600 saying: 'I have not seen its like.' The monastery grounds and buildings were extensive, bounded by Copthall Avenue, Throgmorton Street and London Wall. In the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries it was counted a worthy burial place for famous persons! At the dissolution of the monasteries in 1538 Thomas Cromwell, the Lord Privy Seal, Sir Richard Riche, Solicitor General, and Sir William Poulett secured part of the grounds and buildings for their personal use. The last-named, later obtained the choir and transepts which he used for the storage of coal and corn. His son subsequently sold the tombs and monuments for £100 and converted this part of the building into stables. In 1545 the nave was used as a store for wine and alum. Five years later the Dutch community occupied the nave and aisles by right of the Charter.

Geographically the church was well placed, in the very heart of the city. Of its first two ministers, Wouter Delenus was the scholar and Maarten Micron the more popular preacher. With à Lasco they published several books to serve as manuals of Church discipline, liturgical orders of worship, text-books for the instruction of children and catechumens, and collections of Psalms for the use of the congregation. Gradually the little Community fixed its liturgy and its Church order. Then, quite suddenly, the young King died and was succeeded by his half-sister Mary. Immediately the policy was reversed and once more the exiled Protestants were in danger. Some remained in London, but a large number sailed on two Danish ships to Denmark. There they were suspected of being revolutionaries, and so began a long pilgrimage from place to place, finding the Lutherans looked upon them as Anabaptists. At last they reached Emden where they found a safe refuge.

After the accession of Queen Elizabeth it soon became obvious that the position was changed once more and, within a few months, the refugees began to return to London. Unfortunately the outburst of John Knox blowing his trumpet against 'the monstrous regiment of women' made the Queen somewhat suspicious of all who were described as 'Reformed'. When, at last, Adriaan van Haemstede, through the influence of Lord Burghley secured the royal permission for reinstatement in Austin Friars, the conditions were more severe than they had been originally. The Community was placed under the supervision of the Bishop of London and so was no longer '*corpus corporatum et politicum*,' as it had been previously described. The new conditions involved some changes in church order. There were four ministers, twelve elders, and fourteen deacons, but the place of Superintendent was occupied, theoretically, by the Bishop of London, and à Lasco did not return. Under the earlier and more independent régime a meeting had been held every Thursday, called the 'prophesy'. The congregation assembled to meet the minister to discuss the 'doctrine' he had preached the previous Sunday. 'Prophets' were nominated to raise questions which 'in the sermons of the preceding weeks appear to have been presented either incorrectly, obscurely, or inadequately'. Actually it was a kind of discussion group, which never became an intimate fellowship like the Methodist Class-meetings of a later period. The idea originated in Zürich and was modified by Zwingli, so as to avoid any suspicion of association with the Anabaptists. Calvin was definitely opposed to the practice but à Lasco had



established it in the London Community. In 1571 it was finally abandoned.

During the next few years the Dutch congregation in London became more important to the Reformed Church in the Low Countries. Appeals were made for ministers to be 'prepared' and sent to the Continental churches. It 1572 money, cannon, and grain were forwarded to Dordrecht and, in answer to the urgent requests of the Prince of Orange, a small contingent went from London to serve as soldiers at Flushing. As the ties between England and the Low Countries grew stronger, pressure came from Sir Francis Walsingham that the Dutch congregations in London, Norwich, and Colchester should send men, money, and munitions, and every possible response was made. Still further demands came when the threat of the Spanish Armada developed, though the Community warned Walsingham that their resources were heavily strained. 'Our numbers are small. We maintain four ministers, three students, sixty poor families, and in addition, many poor displaced persons.' Nevertheless they supplied money to provide a Dutch company to serve under Sir Francis Drake. During the critical years which followed, the London Community was of immense importance to the cause in the Low Countries. Its unity and stability, its generosity and moral courage coupled with unswerving loyalty was a constant encouragement to those who were in the 'front line' of the battle.

Meanwhile there was a watchful eye kept on the doctrinal position of the congregation. Heresy hunts were not infrequent, and the Justus Velsius and Van Haemstede cases roused considerable interest, ending in the vindication of the 'orthodox' party. Anything which suggested a likeness to the tenets of the Anabaptists was viewed with alarm by the English authorities, just as in a later day they were scared lest the Methodists were 'Enthusiasts' in disguise! It was due to this outside pressure that the congregation adopted methods which were almost inquisitorial, but presently these were relaxed and a more tolerant attitude made liberal views less suspect. As the religious struggle on the Continent died down, the London congregation enjoyed greater freedom in matters of doctrine.

The internal discipline of the Community was strict though 'brotherly' and there appear to have been three stages in procedure. First the offender was admonished, then if he did not mend his ways he was refused admission to Holy Communion and finally might be punished by excommunication—a drastic sentence 'which meant a forfeiting of eternal blessing . . .'. Marital infidelity, greed, intemperance, domestic quarrels, sexual immorality, gambling, perjury, ill-treatment of children, imprisonment for debt, and attendance at Mass were amongst the cases recorded as coming before the Council. Notwithstanding these the standard of morality of the Community was relatively high. Care was taken to safeguard physical health. People suffering from certain diseases were asked to sit apart if they attended the services. 'Honest exercises of the body'—ball-games, shooting, and the like—were permitted.

Generally speaking the Church was eager to help its members when they were in financial distress. A poor man wanting to get married was assisted by the proceeds of what would be called today 'a retiring collection'. Debtors were released from prison after the Community had raised the money to pay the debt. Ransom money was provided to set free a boy captured by Turkish pirates. In the seventeenth century aid was sent to Germany to help people broken in the Thirty Years War. So, gradually, a social conscience developed in this little company, who were still exiles living in a foreign land, yet who were now playing a worthy part in the life of the City where they had settled.

In two illuminating chapters Dr. Lindeboom describes in detail the relation-

ship of the congregation at Austin Friars with other Reformed Churches and their struggle with Archbishop Laud.

During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the life of the Community was less highly-coloured. The threat to its existence from the High Church party had passed. The sterner Puritans found signs of laxity and extravagance but, on the whole, the Nonconformists looked upon the Dutch with friendly eyes. In the Hanoverian period Austin Friars was never closely connected with the Court, which had its own Dutch chaplains and left the London Community in happy isolation. It appointed its own ministers, schoolmasters, and 'comforters of the sick'. Various experiments were tried in the form of Bible Classes but they were not long-lived and during the eighteenth century this Church, like many others, declined both numerically and spiritually. It had no longer to fight for its existence, and its members were content to adopt what was almost an attitude of *laissez-faire*.

When the church itself was partly destroyed by fire in 1862 the disaster seemed to offer a challenge to which the whole Community responded. The building was restored and gradually many amenities were added. Once more the Community began to develop a vigorous spiritual life. It regained its old position as a national centre for all Dutch people living in London. Royal visits were marked by special deputations of welcome from the congregation at Austin Friars, which had always been loyal to the House of Orange.

Though it is not bound by definite ties to the Netherlands Reformed Church it accepts letters of commendation gladly. On the other hand it issues its own letters to those who are leaving: 'X, being a member of the Netherland Reformed Church in London, and as far as known to us not having been guilty of offensive conduct, the members of the honourable Consistory to whom this, our testimonial, will be handed, are requested to recognize the aforementioned X as such, to extend to him their pastoral care and to admit him to the Holy Communion of our Lord Jesus Christ.'

In our own day the Dutch colony in London has grown considerably in size and importance. It has its own clubs and societies, and the Church at Austin Friars is no longer the only rallying-point for Dutch nationals. This, as Dr. Lindeboom says, 'is the natural outcome of a process of secularization'. This process has had many indirect consequences, yet it has never succeeded in satisfying the deepest needs of man. So this little Community has survived the centuries and we believe will continue to fulfil its definite mission.

During all its interesting and, at times, romantic history it has never been more surely a 'city of refuge' than during the Second World War, when Queen Wilhelmina and the Netherlands Government spent a long and anxious exile in England. In one tragic night it became obvious that the Dutch Church in London was something much more than a building. On the 15th October 1940, a landmine fell on Austin Friars and completely destroyed the church. Only a few pages of the pulpit Bible and odd fragments of walls and monuments lay on the great heap of rubble. This happened on Tuesday but the next Sunday the Community gathered to worship in the air-raid shelter of a bank in Threadneedle Street.

Once more the English people and the English Church had an opportunity of offering shelter to the little congregation whose faith defied the bombs. The church of St. Mary in Bourdon Street, Berkeley Square was put at their disposal and the congregation has continued to worship there, since 1940. To this church Queen Wilhelmina came regularly during the war years. Its minister rendered distinguished service as a chaplain and the Dutch service-men found

in it a benediction. Here the present minister, R. H. van Apeldoorn, is building a new congregation round the nucleus of the loyal and experienced members of the Consistory, who still remain. As soon as may be a new church will be built on the site of Austin Friars. Meanwhile the Community itself continues to minister to all Dutchmen—not least to those from South Africa—who find within this living Church a strange unity which neither war nor rumours of war can destroy.

The researches of Dr. Lindeboom have given us a book<sup>1</sup> of great historic interest but they have done something more. They have shown us how the life of the Dutch people has been closely interwoven with our own, through years of struggle and of suffering. In this new knowledge we may rejoice and take courage. Who shall say what new tasks await our peoples in the reshaping of the world? We have been linked together by spiritual bonds, more closely than by any political expediency, and it is that spiritual kinship which may prove of the greatest importance in the coming days.

<sup>1</sup> *Austin Friars: History of the Dutch Reformed Church in London, 1550-1950*, by J. Lindeboom, Theol. Dr., Professor of Church History in the University of Groningen. Published by Martinus Nijhoff, The Hague (1950).

---

## Articles

### THE COMING GREAT CHURCH<sup>1</sup>

#### I

IT IS BECOMING widely recognized that, by any human standards which might be proposed, the nineteenth century was the period of largest, most varied, and most notable Christian achievement in the nearly two millennia of the Church's history.

In terms of geographic extension, the rapidly multiplying agencies of the Christian Mission carried the Gospel to the utmost circumference of human habitation, to peoples and areas and even continents previously untouched by Christian influence. Only one who has been at pains to examine the facts with some care can appreciate at their full significance the sweep and reach and depth of that penetration. It can be appreciated most readily by a simple comparison of two world maps showing the limits of the Church's outmost boundaries at the beginning and at the close of the century. It is vividly symbolized in the fact that our most authoritative *History of the Expansion of Christianity*<sup>2</sup> finds it necessary to devote approximately the same space to summarize that 'expansion' during the nineteenth century as is required for the record of the preceding eighteen centuries. History knows no parallel to this achievement. No other movement has spread so rapidly or so widely or won so many persons of so many races and cultures to its adherence in a comparable period of time. The upshot has been summarized in words already quoted in an earlier chapter of this volume:<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> This article is from *The Coming-of-Age of Christianity*, edited by Sir James Marchant (Latimer House, 12s. 6d.).

<sup>2</sup> K. S. Latourette, 7 vols.

<sup>3</sup> See Footnote 1.

Today in all the representative regions of the globe and in every land save three . . . there are organized Christian Churches. For the first time in Christian history the Church has become 'ecumenical' in the literal meaning of that word. Its boundaries are co-extensive with the inhabited globe.

In terms of accessions to membership, the Christian Churches during the past century multiplied the numbers of their adherents many fold, far more rapidly than the corresponding increases in population. While precise figures are not available, there can be no question that this numerical growth surpassed the record of the Christian movement, or of any other movement, in any previous century. It must be accounted for not simply by missionary extension into new areas or by normal increases within Christian families, but also by conversions on an unprecedented scale in lands already nominally Christian. At the century's end, Christianity claimed the allegiance of about one-third of the earth's populace, a larger proportion of living persons than had ever before given their adherence to any single loyalty.

But the accomplishments of Christianity during the nineteenth century were not confined to geographic expansion and numerical growth. In terms of influence upon the common life of humanity, Christian ideals and the labours of Christians effected greater emancipations, reforms, and improvements in the lot of all sorts and conditions of men than had ever before been wrought by any single influence in any previous epoch. Wherever the Church carried its evangel of spiritual liberation and redemption, it bore also the unfailing Christian concern for healing of body, enlightenment of mind, elevation of the circumstances of life, and it established the practical instrumentalities—hospitals, schools and colleges, agricultural institutes, and so on, to make that concern effective. To the secular historian, the nineteenth century was the 'century of reform'; virtually every one of the great crusades which distinguished it was inspired by Christian motives and led by men of profound Christian conviction and consecration. Some part of that story has been summarized by Professor Foster and Professor Latourette in this volume.

## II

It is also increasingly recognized that the unique significance of the past century for the history of Christianity is to be discovered not simply in the uniquely effective outreach of the Christian movement both among unevangelized peoples and into unredeemed areas of the common life. Indeed, this century is notable for not one but two developments of unprecedented proportions and power within the Christian Churches. Parallel to the movement of Christian Missions was the movement for Christian Unity.

The latter development found manifold forms of expression. To the uninitiated, the varieties and complexities of the movement for Christian Unity are a source of confusion and bafflement. To the discerning historian, they are clear evidence of its spontaneity, dispersion, and strength. All proceeded from a single impulse and resolve—to overpass traditional barriers and long-accepted chasms between Christians, to join inadequate resources for a more worthy witness and a more effective programme, to approximate more nearly that wholeness of the Body of Christ to which all Christians had always been,

in principle, committed. Here, again, only an informed and disciplined exercise of imagination can lead one into a comprehension of either the novelty or the magnitude of the achievement. Two comparisons may assist this effort after understanding.

During the first eighteen centuries of Christian history, despite unceasing prayer for the unity of Christ's Church, much talk, and no little conference, hardly a single important achievement of Church union was recorded.<sup>4</sup> On the contrary, almost every one of the eighteen centuries witnessed at least one new schism of major proportions; following the Protestant Reformation, divisions within the Church multiplied to the present shameful total of close to three hundred. In the nineteenth century, no new schism of serious magnitude occurred, the first century in the nineteen of which this could be said. On the contrary, the past hundred and fifty years have witnessed a steady succession of actual Church unions, totalling nearly a hundred. As Bishop Neill has pointed out in the preceding essay, some of these took the form of *re*-unions within great denominational families, Methodist, Presbyterian, etc. But a significant, and steadily increasing, proportion of consummated unions brought together Churches of diverse and sometimes sharply contrasted Communion, as in the United Church of Canada and the Union Churches in South India, Japan, China, North India, and the Philippine Islands. Here, again, history knows no parallel or precedent in the Christian centuries.

The second comparison is this. Just prior to the dawn of the nineteenth century, so far as our records show, there was hardly an organization or fellowship of any kind, whether in a local community or in a nation, through which Churches or even individual Christians of different denominational affiliations came together to confer regarding their respective Christian tasks, let alone to plan and work together in the discharge of common Christian responsibilities. Today, a century and a half later, there are thousands of interdenominational bodies—from councils or federations of Churches in many hundreds of towns and cities (over seven hundred in the United States alone); through national Councils of Churches in almost every country of Europe, North and South America, Asia, Africa, and Australasia, where diverse Christian Communions are found in any considerable diversity and strength, supplemented by a variety of other national interdenominational agencies of co-operation in specialized tasks such as religious education, home missions, foreign missions, women's work, youth work, etc., and through hundreds of specific union enterprises especially in 'mission lands' in such fields as general education, medicine, and theological training, up to the climax of this intricate structure of Christian co-operation in half a dozen world Christian bodies—representing the great bulk of Protestant and some Orthodox Communions. These 'ecumenical' bodies, in turn, plan and work in the closest collaboration with and through the organization which all recognize as the 'copestone of the ecumenical arch', the newly formed World Council of Churches. Indeed, the formal launching of the World Council at Amsterdam in August 1948 may be regarded as the placing of that copestone.

In the first eighteen centuries, frequent and increasing schism; in the nine-

<sup>4</sup> The most notable was the reunion of the greater part of the Roman Catholic Communion, following the 'papal schism', at Constance in 1415.



teenth century, no new major division. In the first eighteen centuries, hardly a single concrete achievement of Church union; in the last century and a half, nearly a hundred fully consummated mergers of previously independent national Church bodies. Up to the eve of the nineteenth century, no Christian fellowship across denominational divisions; at the middle of the twentieth century, thousands of vigorously functioning agencies of trans-denominational collaboration. These are among the facts which justify Sir Ernest Barker's arresting assertion on the eve of the Oxford and Edinburgh Conferences of 1937: 'Our century has its sad features. But there is one feature in its history which is not sad. That is the gathering tide of Christian union.'

## III

These two developments of the past century and a half, the Movement of Christian Missions and the Movement for Christian Unity, stand in striking contrast in underlying tempers and immediate objectives—one pressing outward across the earth and into secular society as Christians faced with new insight the unredeemed needs of their world, the other turning inward as Churches faced up with new honesty to the un-Christian scandal of their own divisions. Actually, they have been intimately related. To a marked degree, they sprang from the same sources—the remarkable series of spiritual renewals associated with the Moravians, the Wesleys, Moody and Drummond, and others. Previously, religious revival had usually induced Christian schism: but 'the religious awakenings of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries have been among the most potent sources of the growing movement toward Christian unity'.<sup>5</sup> The two movements were driven by similar compulsions, especially a greatly quickened awareness of obligation to fulfil Christ's command: 'That they all may be one . . . that the world may believe.' In considerable measure, the two developments pressed forward under identical leadership.

Although the relation has been intimate, it has not been strictly reciprocal. Causative influence has moved preponderantly from the first to the second; it is a commonplace that Christian Missions have been the principal parent of Christian Unity. It was altogether appropriate, indeed inevitable, that the first great interdenominational Christian conclave in modern times should have been a world *missionary* convention, at Edinburgh in 1910; and that from it should have come, directly and indirectly, the germinative seed-plots of the several world movements for Christian co-operation. Much earlier, it had been a common sense of obligation for a more vigorous and effective fulfilment of common *missionary* obligations which had enabled Christians of different traditions to transcend historic barriers and come together for conference and united action. It has been the requirements of their *missionary* programmes which have pushed Christians into most forms of interdenominational collaboration. From the directors of these programmes on the mission field itself has come the most urgent insistence upon larger and speedier Christian Unity. It is among the Younger Christian Churches, richest fruitage of missionary outreach, that concrete achievement in almost every type and phase of Christian Unity has advanced fastest and farthest.

<sup>5</sup> Latourette, unpublished memorandum.

The main point, however, is that these two developments (which stand forth from the history of Christianity in the past century and a half, and give to that period a character as distinctive and more distinguished than any previous 'great age' of Christian faith) must be seen as two phases of a single movement. The interrelationship has become closer, and has been recognized as such, with each passing decade. Today, 'ecumenical Christianity' refers to the one movement in its dual aspects. And this relationship has been given both symbolic expression and practical implementation in the linking of the two organizations which most fully represent the respective movements on a world scale: (1) *The International Missionary Council* in association with the World Council of Churches and (2) *The World Council of Churches* in association with the International Missionary Council.

Those who are entrusted with the destiny of Christianity in our day and those who essay to forecast its prospects for the days ahead need to hold firm grip upon this unchallengeable fact: they are inheritors of the mightiest accomplishments for human welfare and of the most notable fulfilments of Christian duty which have ever been entrusted to a single generation. They are heirs of what has been rightly called 'The Great Century', the greatest in Christian history, or indeed in the history of mankind.

#### IV

The achievements of the 'Great Century' suggest potentialities of Christian consummation in the last half of the twentieth century surpassing those which have been realistic possibilities for any earlier generation. If we imagine these two parallel and interrelated developments advancing along the same lines and at the same steadily increasing tempo through the next fifty years, the dawn of the second Christian millennium might witness an approximation to the goal of Christ's regnancy throughout the earth and of the unity of His followers in one 'Great Church'.<sup>6</sup>

To be sure, the ideal of all mankind brought into obedience to Christ has commanded the leaders of the Church from the earliest days, and has furnished the theme not only for poets' dreams but also for prophets' forecasts. But those forecasts have usually been in the fevered accents of apocalyptic expectation and premised upon catastrophic divine intervention. Indeed, the interest in reaching every creature with the message of the Gospel has often sprung from the conviction that this is the divinely appointed precondition for Christ's return in glory for judgement. Sixty years ago, a company of ardent Christian youth in launching the Student Volunteer Movement for Foreign Missions boldly took as their watchword: 'The evangelization of the world in this generation.' We now know that this goal was inspired more by youthful daring than by a mature appraisal of the task. But today, with the instruments of mass communication already available plus others which the next fifty years will almost certainly perfect, the fulfilment of the age-old Christian goal that every living creature should have heard the message of Christ looms, for the first time, as a realistic possibility. This would not mean that every person

<sup>6</sup> cf. Canon T. E. Wedel's stimulating book, *The Coming Great Church*, from which this essay takes its title.



would have professed allegiance to Christ; but the universal proclamation of the Gospel would have been achieved.

Again, if we attempt to measure the outcome of another half century's progressive advance toward Christian Unity, we are hardly justified in picturing that outcome in terms of a single ecclesiastical organization. To entertain such a hope is to fly in the face of the deeply rooted intransigence of the Roman Communion. But that, by the year 2000, virtually all the rest of Christendom might be embraced within a single community of mutual acknowledgement and mutually sustaining fellowship is not, granted an unbroken continuance of recent progress, beyond the limits of possibility.

## V

The record of the 'Great Century' suggests such realistic possibilities of Christian consummation by the year 2000. It does not guarantee them. On the contrary, only the irresponsible dreamer will deliberately blind his eyes to ominous countervailing factors which not only threaten the hope of continuing advance but even imperil the amazing gains already won. It is essential to assess these negative possibilities at their full weight.

No one should underestimate the glory of recent missionary outreach. But it must be recognized that it has as yet barely touched the fringes of that vast mass of humanity whom we speak of as the 'non-Christian world'. It is true that about one-third of the earth's populace is now at least nominally Christian. But in the vast continents of Asia, Africa, and Oceania, the proportion is somewhat less than three per cent. Among the larger and more mature nations of the Orient where Christian Faith has recorded some of its most noteworthy triumphs, those brought into the Church's membership seldom exceed two per cent. Outside Europe and America, Christians are as yet a numerically insignificant minority. The great bulk of these peoples still acknowledge allegiance to one or another of their historic non-Christian faiths. Moreover, some of the latter are manifesting signs of revitalization, often reinforced by linkage with renascent nationalism. Islam, in particular, is today probably a more successful evangelizer than Christianity.

More ominous for the continued advance of the Church is the unchecked spread of Christian Faith's two most powerful rivals for the allegiance of contemporary men: self-satisfied secularism and self-confident Communism. Of the threat of the latter, China may serve as illustration, all the more disturbing because there Christianity had achieved such outstanding results, claiming as recently as a decade ago a larger proportion of the nation's influential leadership as convinced and practising Christians than any other nation of the East. Now, the entire Christian enterprise in China confronts an uncertain future. A senior missionary teacher in China was in the habit of placing on the walls of his classroom the portraits of three great Christian evangelists to China of former epochs whose successive achievements had been overwhelmed and virtually obliterated by resurgent paganism. He wished to remind his young Chinese Christian pupils that, three times before, Christianity had been successfully introduced into China, only to disappear. Today, his school is closed, its buildings in Communist hands, and its teaching proscribed.

A comprehensive survey of Christian Missions at New Year 1949 carried

the caption: 'Holding the Bridgeheads.' The title was well chosen. This does not imply that there are no new and promising advances being pushed forward, here and there, at many different points, in various parts of the world. But the overall picture of the Christian World Mission at the beginning of the second half of the twentieth century is less that of a triumphant advance than that of a resolute 'holding' operation. So far as one can pierce the future, that promises to be its predominant character in the days ahead. It is no part of Christian optimism to evade this threatening outlook, as it is no part of Christian realism to permit it to chill the temper of Christian confidence or cut the nerve of Christian effort.

The situation in areas traditionally Christian needs no exposition. Commenting upon the fact that the 1949 religious census in the United States reveals that somewhat over half of the population are Church members and that their number is still increasing more rapidly than that of the total populace, Dr. Samuel McCrea Cavert thus summarizes a situation which is certainly not more unfavourable than in most nominally Christian lands:

There has never been a time in American history when so large a percentage of the people belonged to the Churches. . . . [But] those who attend public worship regularly or in other ways participate actively in the life of the Church are far fewer than those who call themselves members. . . . Any thoughtful observer would detect a disturbing discrepancy between the size of the Churches and their influence on American life.

Christians are reluctant to admit that the strength and power for advance of the Church is, in appreciable measure, dependent upon political or economic factors in the general life of the times. But history shows conclusively that it is so. One of Dr. Latourette's largest services to our understanding of the logic of the expansion of Christianity is his clear delineation of successive epochs of advance and retreat, and his further conclusion that both progress and recession run parallel to, and are vitally influenced by, corresponding surges and retreats in the fortunes of the cultures and states with which the Church has become largely identified. Moreover, he is certainly correct in linking the 'Great Century' of Christian advance with the period of dominant ascendancy of Western Civilization and, more particularly, in identifying the year 1914—the beginning of the epoch of the Great Wars—as the terminal date of that period. This does not necessarily imply that we have already entered upon another phase of recession, though there is sufficient evidence to prompt such a sombre prediction. If subsequent events should justify it, the Amsterdam Assembly of 1948 would appear in the perspective of history as marking both the culmination of a century and a half of mighty achievement and as the terminus of that unparalleled epoch. In any event, the responsible leadership of the Christian Cause might be dismissed as blind leaders of the blind unless they are prepared to contemplate such a possibility, and to scan the future and lay their plans for it with such a possibility clearly in view.

HENRY PITNEY VAN DUSEN

*(To be continued)*

---

## THE MYSTERY OF THE HOLY TRINITY

SO 'The Father is God', runs one of the several clauses in the Athanasian Creed (probably-so-called because St. Athanasius had nothing whatever to do with its authorship) dealing with the Holy Trinity in Unity: 'the Son is God; and the Holy Ghost is God. And yet there are not three Gods, but One God.'

I am not here directly concerned with any attempt to establish by reasoning, scientific or otherwise, the Being of God, but with the fact that He cannot be (as the Jews and Moslems, followers of the other two great monotheistic creeds, believe) an Absolute Monad, but, as Christianity, through the direct teaching of Jesus Christ Himself asserts, a Trinity in Unity. Yet because, perhaps, there are very many, maybe even a majority of thinking people who cannot accept the Being of God at all (and who, therefore, will certainly not be at all interested whether He be an Absolute Monad or a Trinity in Unity), without some rational foundations, I would preface this article with a short paragraph of *negative* evidence for His Being, and also point out that the scientific approach itself is most certainly not the only one, because itself incomplete, to the mystery of the Universe.

Let us, then, provisionally assume with the atheist that there is no God, noting, incidentally, that the atheist lives by faith as much as the theist: for whereas the latter says, 'I believe there is a God', the former declares 'I believe there is *no* God'.

From the atheist's standpoint there is, among other things, no guiding, conscious, purposeful Intelligence behind the universe, which has only come into being by fortuitous means. On this basis, the process we call 'thought' is really caused by the atoms of our physical brains, for chemical or physical purposes, constantly changing their positions.

What right have any of us to prefer the utterances of, say, a scientist, to those of a madman in a padded cell? After all, it is only because of the different positions assumed by the atoms in the brain of one at any instant, from those in the brain of the other, that the former gives utterance to one kind of thought and the latter to another. It is quite senseless to say that one is sane and the other insane: that the thoughts of the one are valid, and of the other invalid. It is no answer to say that the thoughts of the scientist fit known experiences, and therefore we are more likely to accept his theories, because those experiences are only known to him and us in the way they are owing to the position the atoms in our brains happen to occupy: the experiences of the so-called insane person come to him for exactly the same reason. Neither is valid, and neither is invalid, for the simple reason that everything is purely relative, including thought itself.

Therefore on this atheistical assumption, reason itself is completely untrustworthy as a guide; it cannot be relied upon at all. But the atheistical theory itself is the product of reason. Therefore, the atheistical theory is wholly invalid: whence we see that atheism contains the seeds of its own refutation, even as determinism does: for the determinist, declaring that we believe what we do because we cannot help ourselves reduces belief in

determinism to the same level: that is, determinists believe in determinism, not because it is necessarily correct, but because it is ordained that they shall do so. In any case, determinism must be considered as finished in the light of the modern remarkable evidence for the Principle of Indeterminacy, which, according to the late Professor Sir Arthur Eddington, in a personal account I was privileged to receive from him shortly before his death, is now as firmly established (to the complete discredit of determinism) as any theory can well be without passing into the realm of absolute fact.

All the foregoing simply means that we can never use reason or thought to disprove the Being of God: for it is only by right of His Existence that reason receives its great powers and is exalted to the high position it justly holds; but receives and holds only because of the Being of a guiding, conscious, purposeful Intelligence behind the universe: namely God, who alone gives to it meaning and rationality, and sets it up as the great criterion of knowledge that it is; and the sooner the so-called 'rationalists' realize this, the sooner will they be able to play a great part in the history of mankind, and not, as now, an obstructionist and foolish one, vainly kicking against the pricks.

Finally, that there is what I will provisionally term an ultra-scientific world, is surely obvious for the following reasons:

(i) When what is rather loosely termed 'modern science' began somewhere about a century ago, it quite deliberately announced that it was going to limit its investigations to those parts of the universe that could be *metrically* dealt with. It did not deny, for instance, axiology, but it did definitely leave it out of its account. Hence all science is but abstraction from total Reality: the abstraction of that part of Reality that lends itself to metrical treatment; hence it is not at all marvellous that the Universe of Science should be cold, harsh, and forbidding; because all the imponderables that fall outside the metrical, and which banish that coldness, harshness, and forbiddingness have been deliberately excluded from the scientific picture: which therefore, as said before, only presents us with *part* of the truth about the universe: just as the representation of Man as a purely rational being omits his emotional side, and therefore presents us with but half the picture: or as his representation as a purely emotional being omits his rational side, and again presents us with but half the picture; each description, claiming to represent the *whole*, presenting us, in truth, with only an abstraction of that whole.

Our ignoring of the imponderables in the universe no more excludes their reality than the ignoring, say, of the emotional side of Man excludes the reality of man's emotions. True man is composed of both the rational and the emotional, however some of us would *like* him to be composed: so the true universe is composed of both the ponderables (which fall naturally within the scientific sphere) and of the imponderables (which slide through its not-fine-enough mesh).

(ii) Let us for the moment consider the manner in which we perceive colour. Electro-magnetic waves impinge themselves on our optic nerves: something mysterious, and as yet wholly unexplained, as the late Sir Arthur Eddington admitted, then occurs, and we *see* colour; but both the electro-magnetic waves *and* the optic nerves are themselves entirely *colourless*. It is against all natural, scientific laws that the combination of two elements should, however complex

the resulting compound, produce in that compound a *quality* utterly lacking in either of the component parts separately. Yet patently in the case of 'seeing' colours, this is what occurs. Hence we have evidence that there is a sphere outside the scientific one.

(iii) The word 'evolution' (often spelt with a capital initial 'E') is very loosely referred to by many laymen today. Yet evolution, which is merely an observed process of the way in which certain events happen, itself postulates an ultra-scientific sphere and standard. For evolution implies an unfolding. An unfolding into or an evolving toward what?

The extreme evolutionist is purely subjective. That is, the object of life's development, he holds, is somehow part of, being potential in, life itself: the purpose and goal of evolution, that is, he declares lies within the evolutionary process itself.

This is patently absurd. For, firstly, if there be no eternal reality into which the evolutionary process is unfolding, there can obviously be no measurement of progress. But the evolutionist is always talking about 'the natural progress of Man: that, by the laws of evolution, he will in time outgrow all his evil traits, and all will eventually be well'.

But if nothing lies outside the evolutionary process, all that the evolutionist can honestly do is to note that things change. Whether for better or for worse, he cannot say. Who is to judge whether the life, ideals, and motives of this generation are better or worse than those of, say, three generations ago? They have changed: yes; but to say they are better or higher, or worse or lower, is nonsense: because such terms as 'better' and 'worse' imply *measurement*: they are, in fact, *measuring* terms; and measurement *implies a standard other than what is measured*: that is, there must be an external reality against whose *absolute value* the progress, or it may sometimes be the regress, of the evolutionary process can be measured. That is, there must be an *external goal* toward which the evolutionary process is evolving: and this, in theology, comes under the heading of eschatology and teleology.

Here, then, a second loophole is found in the scientific boundary, leading into a realm beyond natural science itself.

(iv) The most wonderful thing in the whole wonderful universe is Man himself: for wonderful as the universe is, whether we regard its mighty size and the galaxies of stars composing it, or whether we regard the no less marvellous microcosm of atoms, electrons, protons, neutrons, and positrons: yet the Mind of Man has found out all about these things, and, bursting through Time and Space, though yet confined by both (thus surely exhibiting certain signs of him, like God Himself, being both immanent and transcendent), announces himself as mightier than all his wonderful discoveries.

It must always be remembered that all the sciences have been invented by Man's mind. Now, the youngest of the sciences is psychology, wherein Man has turned his piercing scientific searchlight on himself; but, like all other sciences, it is the child of Man's own mind: *and as such is not so great as the mind that invented it.*

Therefore, no science invented by Man's mind (and that is the only kind of science possible) will ever be able to tell him all about himself, because the



science will be studying something that is greater than itself: namely, Man's mind that has created it.

Therefore there will always be a mysterious, unknown part of Man; and we have a third, and here final, loophole in the scientific boundary; sufficient proof that science is by no means all, and that a vast area lies for ever beyond its ken, wholly beyond its powers ever to study.

It is just because of this that on the question of the Being of God, strict science is absolutely neutral; realizing that it is not equipped to give an answer as the realm that deals with Deity is far beyond its dictum, and we must surely see that if by its mere pointer readings and mathematical symbols (which is all that science comprehends) science could give any positive proof of the Deity, that Deity would be a farce, a fiasco, to be capable of reduction to such terms.

Before proceeding with our subject, we must also remember that although the dictum of science cannot extend to the spiritual sphere (for that is the great area that we have seen lies outside it), yet that spiritual sphere can and does extend its influence into the realm of science: that is, although the lesser (i.e. science) cannot be used to entirely comprehend the greater (i.e. the spiritual sphere) yet that greater can be used to comprehend the lesser. Hence we may expect to find *some* signs of this ultra-scientific world in the world of science itself: which is why, in the following, we are able to deduce arguments leading to the establishment of the Trinitarian Doctrine culled in some cases from physical science.

(1) At the root of the physical world there is a very strange formula indeed: namely:  $pq - qp = \frac{ih}{2\pi}$

Never mind for the moment what the symbols stand for: we can substitute figures to make plain the glaring and astounding nature of this equation. It would mean, for instance, that  $2 \times 3 - 3 \times 2 = \text{something}$  (i.e. *not* NOTHING).

Yet physicists assure us that this mysterious formula does lie at the base of the whole physical universe: and from this it follows plainly that in the real, objective world that underlies and comprehends within itself that mere abstraction we term the scientific world, our metrical figures are not at all of the nature they are here in our everyday world.

That this is indeed so is strikingly shown by the new so-called hyper- or metamathematics used by Einstein to explore the fourth dimension: it is not necessary to say more here than that these hypermathematics take us into a world not of our own creation, as our three-dimensional one is: where it does not follow that a value is equal to itself, where of two equal magnitudes, the first may be infinitely greater than the second: where a curved line is not longer than a straight one: and where the angles of a triangle do not add up to two right angles.

Such eminent mathematicians as Reimann, Helmholtz, Lambert, Ouspensky, Schofield, and Hinton give weight to the validity of this new dimension (which we call Time, but is really spatial) and the mathematics applicable to it: and although there are a few eminent mathematicians who attack metamathematics as being a figment of the imagination, and quote a certain German astronomer, by name Von Soldner, who about 1800 discovered, with no resort to a fourth dimension, the formula relating to the deviation of light, which explains the displacement of the perihelion of Mercury (a feat which Einstein

also accomplished, but by means of his fourth-dimensional theory; a feat regarded as the supreme triumph of that theory); yet the very fact that Einstein arrived at exactly the same result by the aid of a geometry (Reimann's) which his opponents declare to be fictitious, imaginary, and absurd, seems to me to turn the argument against its user: so that it is actually evidence for the validity of hypergeometry.

Finally, to quote the opinion of Henri Poincaré, the great French mathematician on this subject: incidentally, a man who is not given to pursuing 'will o' the wisps':

'The geometry of  $n$  dimensions has an actual object. Today no one doubts this. The entities of hyperspace are susceptible of definition as precise as the entities of ordinary space, and if we cannot represent them to ourselves we can at least conceive and study them. Thus, though the mechanics of more than three dimensions, for example, might be condemned as possessing no object, the same objection cannot be made to hypergeometry.'

Ouspensky declares, and, I think with some justification, that mathematics escapes from the limits of the visible and measurable world: and although whole provinces of mathematics deal with quantitative relations that do not correspond with any reality in the visible world of three dimensions, yet it is impossible that there should be mathematical relations with which no relation to reality corresponds. Mathematics exceeds the limits of our world and makes its way into an unknown universe and calculates relations which we can neither imagine nor comprehend.

I have dealt at rather full length with this because again is emphasized the existence of a universe outside the normal scientific one: but even more important emerge two significant facts.

(a) Man physically is three-dimensional. There can be no doubt about that. Yet there is some quality about him that can dimly apprehend (though because of the limitations of the body cannot *comprehend*) the presence of higher spatial dimensions: in other words, there is some quality about Man that itself partakes of the supranatural: and that quality is the Mind, which has sought and is still searching out the secrets of these mysterious spheres or hyperspheres.

Man's body cannot travel *at will* through time: but his mind can, as witness with what vividness it can call up any scene of the past; it is at least a moot point that if the mind can travel into the past, can it not also travel into the future?

J. W. Dunne asserts that in dreams it does: Professor Maurice Maeterlinck supports him: J. W. Dunne further asserts that he has so cultivated the art that his mind can now travel into the future as easily as into the past *when he is awake*.

I leave these statements just as they are made: I merely deduce from them (if they be correct: and much evidence is adduced in their favour) further support for Man's Mind (or, speaking theologically, Spirit) being indeed related to worlds above this present three-dimensional one.

(b) Now, as in philology, where the most striking resemblance between two words of two different languages must not be taken to mean that there really is any linguistic affinity between the two, so here we must be very careful not to force parallels. Yet, bearing this constantly in mind, we are surely justified in making the following observation: at the same time clearly asserting that we



are in no wise at one with the ancient Pythagoreans, who held that the universe was *made of numbers*, although no one will deny that number is a moderately important aspect of the universe.

The observation to be made is this: That from the nature of the ultra-scientific world from whence, as it were, our metrical figures seem to exude (the phrase is the late Sir Arthur Eddington's), it is clear from the fundamental formula given some pages earlier, and also from the ensuing discussion of many contemporary mathematicians' theories, that, among other things, in that ultra-scientific world, ONE by no means necessarily, as here with us in our three-dimensional world, implies *bare unity*.

In the structure of the universe we might reasonably expect to see on very close study at least a faint sign of the nature of its Creator: just as on contemplating, say, any intricate piece of machinery, we can at once say that its inventor was a man of remarkably high intelligence.

If we philosophize upon the bare discoveries of science we may, of course, expect to discover some more intimate signs of the Creator's Nature: just as we can deduce more about a man who writes a book or a man who paints a picture, by reading the works of the one and by studying the artistic productions of the other, than we can about a man who designs a house or a machine by a mere study of the completed building or the finished machine: and the machinery of pure science approximates to see the Creator in the light of the Architect of the Universe: while philosophy, and to a much greater extent, of course, religion, see Him as the Author and Artist and thus can give us a more intimate insight into His Nature.

This formula of physical science, showing symbolically what the foundation of the universe is, would also seem to show most certainly from its very character, shadowing the Nature of the Architect of the universe, that whatever else He may be, He is not an Absolute Monad: which at least forms a *negative* support for the Christian Doctrine that He is Three Persons in One God.

(2) If, as the Christian Faith asserts (and I am here assuming the Christian Faith: merely contenting myself with assuring the reader that evidence in its favour is overwhelming), God is Love: what was His position when He *alone* existed: before He created any beings, spiritual or otherwise?

Whom did He love then? If, as the modern Unitarian now declares, and the Jew and Moslem have always declared, He is an Absolute Monad, i.e. a bare Unity, then He must have loved reflexively: that is, loved Himself: in other words *was wholly selfish*. This is unthinkable. But the problem is solved and hence ceases to exist in the light of the Christian Doctrine of the Holy Trinity, which claims that within the true Unity of the Godhead there is room for diversity of Relationship: whence God is seen *not* to have loved Himself, before the creation of conscious beings but each Person of the Holy Trinity to have expended Divine Love upon the other Two Persons.

Despite the claim by some critics that the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity was never taught by Jesus, and is the product of the late second or early third century A.D., showing strong Alexandrine influence, no one can, as a matter of fact, read the New Testament without at once becoming aware that the teaching of Jesus contains elements concerning Himself, His Heavenly Father, and the Holy Ghost: and, furthermore, when He is referring to any of These He

is not just referring to three aspects of One Person: but to three distinct Persons: yet He always speaks of God, and not Gods: i.e. is strictly monotheistic.

It is necessary here to say a few words on the use of the word 'Person'. The Latin Vulgate has the very unhappy translation, '*Persona*' from the original Greek word 'γῆδοταισις': which, as near as we can approximate it, means 'substance' or, better still, 'reality'. Thus the rather gross idea we conjure up at the mention of the word 'Person' in connexion with God was wholly lacking in the Greek original: where the main idea was of *underlying* (the literal translation) *reality*.

The teaching of the Disciples followed these lines. I personally think that His disciples, strict monadists, must have been very puzzled by this doctrine, and, to my mind, nowhere is their honesty more apparent than in the very fact of their having faithfully preached something that must have been a stumbling-block in many ways to them, nurtured as they were in the ancient faith of Israel: probably not seeing that it was a fulfilment (i.e. making *fuller*) of that faith.

It was the fact that this doctrine had been taught for some two hundred and fifty or so years that at last made it necessary to codify it to avoid the twin dangers of (a) crude Tritheism (as can be seen in the Hindu Trinity of Brahma, Indra, Vishnu) and (b) Monadism: while yet retaining pure monotheism.

The difficulties were tremendous: the 'quarrel over a diphthong', as to whether Jesus were 'of a *like* nature to the Father' or 'of *one* nature with the Father' was no mere trivial concern: had Arianism prevailed (although I think none today would impugn Arius himself as anything but a good and honest man who had made a great mistake in doctrine), Christianity would have developed Tritheistically, and there is no doubt would have met the fate of the old pagan religions. And yet there are some who doubt Divine Guidance for the early Church praying that, in all matters, especially those touching such tremendous significance, and so difficult of understanding, they might be guided by God the Holy Ghost.

The Nature of the Holy Trinity in Unity is, and must for ever remain, a mystery: it is certainly for all times beyond the grasp of our finite knowledge: but it is a mystery that, nevertheless, has solved the mystery of a God of Love, who, existing from everlasting, must have been before any created beings; a difficult problem soon propounded by Greek philosophers seeking to discredit the new religion: and, lo, the complete answer lay in that part of the Christian doctrine that was itself a mystery of mysteries. The answer that the Christians had, that of the Holy Trinity in Unity, all ready to hand, was not one arrived at by philosophical speculation: but revealed truth given by Jesus when on earth.

(3) A further intellectual objection was raised. There was a time when God was alone before the creation by Him of any conscious spirits or beings, as we have just seen. Very well. Upon the creation of those spirits or beings, however could God have got into communication with them, as revealed religion constantly declares He did and still does, since communication was an experience absolutely unknown to Him who from everlasting until that moment of creating conscious beings had dwelt *alone*.

This is obviously true were God an Absolute Monad: but once again

Christianity supplies the full answer. God is Three in One; and between the Three Persons of the Holy and Blessed Trinity in Unity there has, from everlasting, been constant communion; whence on the creation of conscious beings, God was quite able to enter into communion with them, communication entailing no new experience for Him.

(4) In philosophy there are two main opposing schools of thought: the monists, who believe that all the diverse things in the universe emanate from one, and hence believe in the fundamental unity and homogeneity of the cosmos; and the pluralists who believe that the universe consists of a number of irreducibly different things: and hence believe in the ultimate fundamental heterogeneity of the cosmos. The remarkable thing is that *both* these diametrically opposed schools of thought are able to bring weighty evidence to bear in favour of their respective and seemingly mutually exclusive doctrines.

It seems to me that here the only solution to be applied is the same as Hegel applied to the antimony of infinite divisibility, on which the arguments of the Greek Eleatic philosopher, Zeno, rested: who said, in effect, that any quantity of space must either be composed of ultimate indivisible units, or it must be divisible *ad infinitum*. If the former, these indivisible units must have magnitude, and we have the contradiction of a magnitude that cannot be divided. If the latter (i.e. if it is divisible *ad infinitum*), then we have the absurdity that an *infinite* number of parts add up and make a *finite* sum-total.

Hegel offered as the solution a rising above the level of the two antagonistic principles, and the taking of them both up to the level of a higher conception, wherein both opposites were reconciled.

So I think with the monists and the pluralists. And what conclusion inevitably follows? Nothing other than that the Universe partakes of both unity and plurality.

This surely reinforces our first point, namely that one deduced from the mysterious formula at the basis of the universe: and we can again see that the Creator of the universe partakes by Nature both of absolute unity and of plurality, since His creative work shows ample signs of being capable of intellectual explanation on *both* those bases. And this is what the Christian Doctrine of the Trinity in Unity declares: that the Godhead is One and Absolute: but that within the Unity of the Godhead there are Three Persons.

(5) Christian revelation declares God, among other attributes, to possess that of Supreme Personality. Now, one of the latest achievements of modern psychology has been to prove that human personality can only be developed *to the full* by constant communion with one's fellow beings. A hermit or recluse can never develop full personality, or anything like it: his personality becomes increasingly stunted as he becomes increasingly wholly introverted. Full personality can only be attained by the impact of mind upon mind, which draws out all that is best in all the minds thus brought together.

It is obvious, then, that if God is from and to all eternity an Absolute Monad, whatever else He may be, He cannot be Supremely Personal.

Again, the Christian Doctrine of the Holy Trinity supplies the answer to this otherwise insoluble problem: within the Unity of the Godhead there are the Three Persons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost: who from all eternity have ever been in communion, the One with the Other, hence supplying that

companionship that is absolutely necessary to the development of full personality.

Hence God's Supreme Personality makes it an utter necessity for Him to be a Trinity in Unity (at this stage we are, of course, looking through the wrong end of the telescope, as it were: later we will look through the right end and get first things first, and thus invert the above statement): and hence once again this most important dogma of Christianity is fully vindicated.

(6) It is surely not without significance that Man himself, though a unity, is, in reality, three in one. For he has (i) shape, or form, which we call 'body' and is shared by him with every organic and inorganic object: he is also, being alive, endued with (ii) a life-force, or soul: and this he shares in common with every living creature, who are hence each a duality in unity: and in addition he has (iii) mind, or spirit, which alone occasions the unbridgable gap between him and the highest primates: hence he himself is a Trinity in Unity.

Here it must be noted that Man's trinity in unity is but a vague and shadowy counterpart of God's: for whereas 'The Father is God, the Son is God and the Holy Ghost is God', we cannot say 'The body is man', 'the soul is man', and 'the spirit is man': but in Man's body, soul, and spirit, we do have, I submit, a vague suggestion of three distinct entities being blended into one creature. An even better example might be Man's intellect, emotions, and will as constituting a trinity in unity: though even then it is not a *true*, but only a vague suggestion of, trinity in unity.

In the Book of Genesis we are told that Man was created in the image of God: whence, *ex hypothesi* (though in addition to the above warning, remember also again that at this stage of the argument we have, as it were, our eye still at the wrong end of the telescope), God also is Trinity in Unity. Of course, in this illustration, it must also be remembered that it is Man's sempiternal mind that is in God's image: but, nonetheless, the analogy holds. And so we have another piece of sound evidence in support of the Christian doctrine of the Holy Trinity. Nor are there lacking in the Old Testament itself signs that God is not, at any rate, a mere Monad: signs which I think the Hebrews themselves would have interpreted as such had they been a nation of philosophers, which they were not, being, far more important, collectively a nation that was a religious genius.

In the First Creation story we read: 'And God said, "Let us create man in OUR own image" . . . Male and female created HE them.'

Notice the US, OUR, and finally HE. To whom does the Us and Our refer? Not to the Angels, themselves created spirits, whose only part in Man's creation could have been one of rejoicing. Then it must refer to God Himself. (In fact, one writer constantly uses the word 'Elohim' for 'God', which is the *plural* form of 'majesty'. This implies plurality. But the plurality is limited to, or rather contained in, a unity by reason of the final HE.

This is not a point to be pressed too much, however, as the plural We and Our may, of course, be simply the 'Royal' We.

In the sixth chapter of Isaiah we find the Prophet in his ecstatic vision, seeing the Cherubim and Seraphim falling down before the Throne of God and saying, 'Holy, Holy, Holy,' which many Christian apologists interpret as a cry of adoration to each member of the Godhead. Hence the plurality in unity becomes limited to a Trinity in Unity.

We are, I think, on even firmer ground, when we read in the Old Testament of the Spirit, Wisdom, and Word of God: here, I feel certain, we have glimmerings of the doctrine of the Trinity, foreshadowed in Hebrew Scriptures before Christ Himself came and definitely taught it.

Concerning the teaching of Jesus on this point, the following is most important.

He stressed the Unity of His Godhead with the Father. 'I and My Father are One.' On another occasion when He said, 'My Father is greater than I', He was referring to His Manhood, touching which He was certainly inferior to His Father: but, as touching His Godhead, there is co-equality and co-eternity. On another occasion when accused by the Pharisees of plucking the ears of corn with His disciples on the Sabbath Day, He retorted, 'My Father worketh hitherto, and I work'.

God the Holy Ghost, in our Christian Doctrine, is regarded as God at work within His own universe: revealing Himself to His creation: constantly at work supporting that creation, without whose constant supporting, creative activity this universe would cease to be: as the Psalmist so graphically expressed it on one occasion, 'He holdeth mine eyelids waking'.

It is a remarkable fact that Sir William Hamilton, one of our leading contemporary physicists, had adduced ample evidence that there is constantly at work in our physical universe a supporting, creative power: and this fully coincides with the Christian doctrine of the Holy Ghost just stated.

Jesus speaks of His Father as being that constant supporting and creative Agency: thus plainly declaring the co-equality and co-eternity of the Holy Ghost with God the Father, even as on the other occasion just quoted, He asserted His own equality with the Father. Then in the Prologue of St. John's Gospel, we have Jesus referred to as the True Light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world.

We have seen that the Holy Ghost Himself is regarded as God present and working in His own universe: revealing Himself to Man 'who spake by the prophets' as the Nicene Creed has it: surely, then, God the Holy Ghost lighteth every man that cometh into the world. Then we see here Jesus Christ claimed to be co-equal and co-eternal with the Holy Ghost: and again in St. John 14<sup>18</sup>, where, after having promised to send the Comforter to them, Jesus tells His disciples that 'He will come unto them': again, surely, a declaration of His co-eternity and co-equality with the Holy Ghost.

I had almost used the word 'identified' throughout this illustration: Jesus *identified* with the Father: the Father *identified* with the Holy Ghost: Jesus *identified* with the Holy Ghost: but it was pointed out to me that the usage of that word would naturally tend to imply an absolute identity of all Three Persons: which is the last thing I wish to convey.

For within the Unity of the Godhead there are three separate and distinct Persons (remember the pooriness of the word 'Person' as a translation from the original Greek): and in the words of the Creed with which we opened our argument, we must not confound the Persons nor divide the Substance.

So I trust that my exposition in its present form is fully understood to imply the Absolute Unity of the Godhead, while affirming the absolute distinctness of the Three Persons in that One Godhead.



Let us now put the metaphorical telescope, already mentioned more than once, the right way round.

When we read a book or study a painting, we can deduce certain characteristics of the author or artist from that perusal or study. But we do not say, '*Because X's book shows such and such a trait, therefore X is so and so*'; or, '*Because Y's painting discloses such and such a characteristic, therefore Y is so and so*'.

Or, if we do, we should not: for it is absurd. For we know the truth of the matter is this. '*Because X is so and so, therefore his book exhibits such and such characteristics*'; and '*because Y is so and so, therefore his painting exhibits such and such characteristics*'.

So, surely, with God. It is not *because* man shows a vague suggestion of being three entities blended into one creature (i.e. is some semblance to Trinity in Unity), that God is Trinity in Unity: but *because* God is Trinity in Unity, *therefore*, Man made in His Image, shows some signs of being a Trinity in Unity also.

It is not *because* Personality needs constant communion with other persons that *therefore* God, Supremely Personal cannot be an Absolute Monad, or else He would never be able to attain to Supreme Personality: but *because* the Supremely Personal God is *not* an Absolute Monad, but a Trinity in Unity, *therefore* our human personality for its full development needs constant communication with other personalities.

Similarly, it is not *because* our physical universe, both scientifically and philosophically, reveals a basis that is neither unity nor plurality, but rather something above and including both, that *therefore* God, its Creator and Architect cannot be an Absolute Monad: but *because* God is *not* an Absolute Monad, but Trinity in Unity, *therefore* the basic structure of our Universe reveals neither a unity nor a plurality, but a combination of the two.

Only we, of course, *have* to begin from the wrong end or we could never start our investigations at all. The wrong end, in fact, is the only end we can begin from, because it is the only end in our grasp. But when we have reached our conclusions, we must remember that we are viewing them from the wrong end: and reverse, as we have done, our telescope: realizing that it is the Nature of the Creator which imposes Itself upon the structure of our universe, and not vice versa.

Now to our God, who, by the Grace of the Holy Ghost has revealed Himself as the Triune Majesty in Unity let us ascribe, as is most justly due, all might, power, majesty, dominion, and honour, both now and for evermore, Amen.

NORMAN ADCOCK

---

## THE REALM OF FAITH

THE WORD 'realm' is one of those romantic ones which need to be used with caution. It has an overplus of suggestion: a 'realm' is a thing that commands loyalty, calls forth love and obedience, and implies a pleasant kind of domination of thought and will. When we speak of a 'field of science' we find ourselves in a world of prose: a real scientist would avoid talking of a 'realm of science'. If he speaks of a 'reign of law', it is as far as he goes: he *must* remain impersonal. But one instinctively thinks of a *realm* of faith. There is a magic about the phrase: it suggests a pleasant place wherein to dwell, a fairy-land for those who prefer such things, even a form of escapism. Faith is often thought of as something divorced from the grim world of reality in which we are condemned to dwell. In this essay my contention is that we have every right to speak of and believe in a realm of faith, to admit its claims on our obedience, and with good heart to embark upon the adventure and experiment to which it calls us. Even the scientist must admit that the proof can only be reached when the experiment is concluded.

Let us first look at some of the objections raised against it, and realize their weight. These objections centre round the necessarily subjective character of all faith, however it is disguised. There is such a thing as corporate subjectivity, which masks itself under an appearance of objectivity to the individual. Belief to order, whether the authority imposing that belief be Church or Bible or State, is only belief on hearsay: I believe because someone else has told me it is so, or something outside of me compels that belief. Belief on authority is by no means confined to the sphere of theology; but we do well to recollect that all theology, however divinely inspired it may claim to be, is the product of human brains as fallible, in essence, as our own. And, to the outsider, our religious practices must also have an air of solemn make-believe about them. We may not bow down to 'idols of wood and stone'; but a similar element of make-believe necessarily enters into all religious observance. Is God as impressed by our service of Him as we are ourselves? We make Him our offerings; but we know quite well that these gifts of ours are actually received and administered by human hands: we call our activity the 'work of God', but know full well it is the work of men and women. Even our prayers are (again of necessity) couched in language such as we might address to a human superior. We may ourselves know that we are reaching out after the unseen and incomprehensible; but the unsympathetic critic may have his own ideas on the subject. It has to be remembered that to the world outside the professional religious man is a mendicant, in that he depends for his livelihood—his material support—on the gifts of other people. Though in this respect he is not different from others (for all professions and trades do the same), yet with him it is particularly noticeable. The 'goods' that it is his business to supply in return are so very far removed from the material benefits the world chiefly respects.

Then there is the bogus element of 'authority' at which I have already hinted. I am not speaking of the personal authority of the true prophet that was so manifest in Jesus, but rather of authority only in its extra-individual aspect, the authority that dragoons and fetters free thought. In this sense authority represents the moral ascendancy of the historic community over the individual. The Catholic finds such an authority in the Church: the Protestant in the Bible. This Church is visibly composed, and always has been, of creatures



like ourselves: this Bible was indubitably written, edited and transmitted by the same fallible means; and we deceive ourselves when we believe that, whether here or there, we have arrived at something infallible. Indeed, the prophets, whose tombs we build and whose words we venerate, were themselves oftentimes rebels against the ecclesiastical authority or the traditional usage of their own times; and the Lord Jesus Himself is the classic instance of the daring innovator, whom the 'Church' tried to silence, but tried in vain.

True, the having of an authority to dictate our beliefs to us is a mighty convenience to individual faith, making it easy and plausible ('after all it is not just an idea of my own, you know'); but a moment's reflection will show its essentially secondary nature. It is man-made just because it is man-accepted, and by no means necessarily divine. Both Bible and Church have a certain authority over the individual: they are parents as it were whom we are bidden to honour, and of whom we will not speak evil. Moreover they transcend and enfold us, and represent to us a consensus of community belief *and conscience* reaching down through the ages. They tell us what the community to which we belong by inheritance and nurture finds worthy of belief and acceptance. This kind of authority, however, is not only confined to the Christian Church and Bible: it is inherent in any religious system whatever, false or true. With such authority there must ever go the unquestioned right of the individual to rebel against it.

A third criticism of the validity of religious faith is that its deliverances are concerned with the unknown, unseen, and unprovable. Again, how could it be otherwise? Our expectations it is said, therefore, *may* be merely a projection of our own hopes and fears into the vacuum of the unknown. Moreover, the apparatus that we have to work with is the language and the thought-forms we derive from the already seen and known. As knowledge of reality increases, these thought-forms become out-dated and obsolete. Science ruthlessly scraps discarded theory; but religion seems to delight in using its old material, and progresses as it were by discovery of hidden meanings in it. God is still thought of as 'our Father': Heaven is still 'above' the earth: and where else should it be? 'God is in Heaven, and man below': let us be thankful it is so still!

The realm of faith is peculiarly liable to fanciful embroidery, to false and limiting conceptualization according to individual predilection or community expectation. Sentiment tends to run riot in the religious mind. There is ample scope for conjecture and vain imaginings. This is inevitable in a world in which 'eye cannot see, nor ear hear, nor can it enter into the heart of man to conceive' the glory of the 'things prepared' for those who love God. From beginning to end the apostle of the things of faith must say: 'Behold I show you a mystery.' We are for ever using our scanty knowledge of the ways of the unknown God to predict the unpredictable and to body forth the unimaginable. We can only use such colours as we have to paint on a blank canvas a picture of the beyond, both of time and thought. 'All God's chilluns got wings.' There was a time I well remember when I myself maintained that, unless in Heaven I had a model train, it would be no heaven for me!

Suggestible as we are, we are very ready to be taken in and led astray, and are easily lost in a maze of conflicting demands upon our credulity, much to the mirth of our friend the enemy. The situation would be one of sheer anarchy of misbelief, were it not for a factor of organization and construction always

operant in the realm of faith, in which both Bible and Church play a leading part. Together, or separately, they give us a canon or norm of what may be usefully and fruitfully believed about God, and thus present a nucleus of systematized theology. Of this self-organization of the realm of faith, two things may be said.

First, that here there is a notable parallelism between the development of scientific and religious thought: in fact the two have interacted upon one another continuously. In both we see a story of the unification of thought, of organization of men's ideas around a centre. As science has come to insist upon a universe that is one despite its diversity, so faith has insisted upon but one God, and a God whose character is also a unity. In Him we have come to affirm a union of personal excellences, which accordingly are regarded as expressions of the Divine. A memorable instance of this tendency is seen in Blake's great hymn, so well-loved today:

*To Mercy, Pity, Peace and Love  
All pray in their distress.*

Those things, he says, which make man truly man; make God, God. This fundamental assurance about God (which could only have been learnt through Jesus Christ and His Cross) gives a unity to the whole scheme of Christian faith. God, being such, will surely declare Himself to His personal creation: this the Christian finds He has done in Christ.

The second thing to be said is in the nature of a paradox. This very self-organization of faith, while it brings sanity and moral beauty into it, lays it open more than ever to the charge of subjectivism. If religion is 'betting your life there is a God', and a God of this sort, where, says the scientist, can there be any *proof* that the bet is a safe one? Is not this faith of yours merely another example, on the grandest scale, of wishful thinking? Your Church hurls its anathemas at those daring to question its pronouncements, *but this does not make them any the more true.*

This is true enough; and, if we were limited to believing only where and what we can 'see' (in the narrow sense of what has already been testified and verified by objective observation), we shall find ourselves condemned to a narrow and sterile view of the meaning both of reality and of human life. The hope has recently been expressed by a great scientist that in thirty years' time he will be able to propound a single mathematical formula that will explain everything that is, and give a key to the universe: but that formula will not make the problem of life easier for anyone. This in the sphere of pure science. In that of applied science the prospect at the moment is infinitely drearier. Scientist and layman alike realize that we are coming to a bankruptcy of the human spirit as we learn more and more how to accomplish the most marvellous of things, and know less and less of any object that shall make these marvellous achievements of ours worth the doing. We can travel faster and faster, but are getting nowhere.

This impotence with which we face the future is an inevitable consequence of confining ourselves to science based on observation of mere fact. Observation of fact can only tell us what has happened, is happening, and will happen unless something happens to prevent the fulfilment of our forecast. In the nature of things it cannot set before us any *end*, to justify the 'progress' it reports as made,

or to show us how progress may yet be made. As a necessary complement to its deliverances, we must have faith, some faith or other, 'believing where we cannot see', by which to live. As knowledge increases from more to more, there must go along with it a faith, as reasoned, articulated, and organized as may be, so that the findings of science may be put at the service of the human spirit as it looks out on the uncharted seas of the future. All this talk of an 'expanding universe' or of 'continuous creation of matter' rather shows up the limitations of human understanding of reality than renders obsolete belief in a God who does understand what puzzles us. There are three very marvellous things: first, the universe; second, the mind of man that has so far discovered and mapped out that universe; and third (and greatest), God who created both. It is thus that faith integrates the 'facts' that science brings to light. Thus we may speak of a realm of faith, and one in which faith dominates.

As to the blank canvas of the future, what we need there is a sufficient picture, as definite as possible, of the 'shape of things to come', or (to adapt Scriptural language) the 'powers' and possibilities 'of the coming age', to win common consent and inspire common hope. There are many things we should like to know but cannot: there are other things of which we must be convinced if we are to look forward at all. Personally I believe that any widespread revival of religion today rests, at least partly, on the fulfilment of this need, the satisfaction of this universal hunger. We can only be saved by hope; and this hope above all needs to be an integrated one, a hope for each because it is hope for the whole race. Community and individual aspirations must be seen to point in the one direction, so that what fills the need of the individual will fill that of the whole community, and vice versa. This problem has somehow been left to this generation to solve. It was one that scarcely arose in the nineteenth century, partly because community progress (in certain areas at least) was so obviously marching ahead on its own, and the evangelist's pre-occupation was therefore with the progress of the individual, and partly because those who did the talking in those days were so little aware of the limited area where the sunshine of happiness and contentment they knew so well prevailed. But all that encouragement of merely individual hope has been scornfully repudiated today: 'pie in the sky' has passed into a proverb of contempt. We know now full well what the Christian message has affirmed from the beginning, that 'no man liveth unto himself'.

It has indeed always been a matter of emphasis. The days of individualistic enterprise seem numbered, whether in this or any other world; and we must speak today in terms of the whole. The custodians and transmitters of the Christian faith have always known that they held in their hands a truth and dynamic beyond their powers of comprehension and use. Two examples of this sense of possession of something pregnant with unrealized possibilities may be taken from the writings of the Wesleys.

The first is from John Wesley's classical sermon on 'Scriptural Christianity'. In the preliminary outline he proposes to 'deal with Christianity

- (1) as beginning to exist in the individual,
- (2) as spreading from one to another, and
- (3) as covering the earth.'

He ends his survey of its progress with a picture of the world as it might be, and will be when the Gospel shall have completed its work, a picture for which world-wide communism (but not with the capital C!) is the only appropriate name. Characteristically it is set forth almost entirely in Scriptural language:

'Being filled with peace and joy in believing, and united in one body, by one Spirit, they all love as brethren, they are all of one heart and soul. Neither saith any of them, that aught of the things which he possesseth is his own. There is none among them that lacketh; for every man loveth his neighbour as himself. And all walk by one rule: Whatsoever we would that men should do unto you, do ye also unto them.'

It is a kind of Christian totalitarianism!

The second example comes from a forgotten hymn of Charles Wesley (No. 773 in the 1904 book). One can scarcely call it a hymn: it is rather an epigrammatic summary in twenty-four short lines of the entire history—past, present, and to come—of the Christian enterprise, from the Day of Pentecost to its consummation. I will quote its two last verses

*Yet still we wait the end,  
The coming of our Lord;  
The full accomplishment attend  
Of Thy prophetic word.  
Thy promise deeper lies  
In unexhausted grace,  
And new-discovered worlds arise  
To sing their Saviour's praise.  
Beloved for Jesu's sake,  
By Him redeemed of old,  
All nations must come in, and make  
One undivided fold.  
While gathered in by Thee  
And perfected in one,  
They all at once Thy glory see  
In Thine eternal Son.*

Here are two examples of Christian optimism, on its manward and its Godward side respectively. As regards the latter, it is interesting to note that the *dénouement* of the story suggests that the final proof can only be seen at the end of the experiment. Note also that it is only 'all at once' that the nations can see what none of them could have seen apart from the others! But note chiefly that the glorious consummation of human history centres around the man Christ Jesus, for whom all live and in whom all human life and activity achieves its unity. Here is a picture of the 'end' more detailed and concrete than that of the classless society of Marxism, and it is a picture that gives meaning and perspective to the human story unfolding through the ages. Here is a hope that embraces the individual in the community; for both alike find their 'heaven of heavens in Jesus' love'.

As there is a field of science, so there is a realm of faith, where faith reigns supreme, not walking by sight but leaving the proof to the end.

G. H. FINDLAY

## THE GREAT LIE OF COMMUNISM

AT LONG LAST, the peoples of Western Europe and America are beginning to be aware of the peril of Communism, and of its menace to the things which they value and have hitherto taken for granted. But the process is only just beginning. It is still in its raw and callow phases. But it has begun. There is slowly dawning a suspicion of what the triumph of Communism in the West would mean in terms of daily life. This, however is as yet no more than a suspicion in the mind of the average man, or Mr. Everyman: just a haze over his mind. If you asked him to be precise, to reduce this haze to definite idea or assertion, he would not be able to do it. But we must not identify reality with definition. We shall be guilty of grotesque error if we conclude that, because Mr. Everyman is unable to tell us exactly what he fears, his hazy awareness of the evil of Communism is, therefore, of no significance. It is precisely this awareness, despite its vagueness, that accounts for the anti-Communist clamour of the popular Press. It merely reflects what already agitates the average man. In being even an echo, it fulfils an immensely valuable and significant function in society. It registers an attitude. We know today that the man next to us in the train and bus is becoming alarmed by Communism.

His alarm is most belated. He has at last wakened up to find that a great deal of mischief has already been done. (Is not 'mischief' a 'more than somewhat' inadequate term to describe the oppression of half Europe by Communism, with its very sinister devices of secret police and lying propaganda?) This is a calamity of the first order—far greater and more disastrous than the Saracen conquest of Southern Europe in the eighth century. Those Arabs with their fanatical monotheism were apostles of light compared to the secularized barbarians who have overrun Eastern Europe, and whose fifth columns are entrenched within the fortress of the West. Mr. Everyman has indeed overslept, as also have his rulers and betters. Why?

This is a profoundly significant question, which we shall do well to ponder and answer. There is no greater irony in the history of modern Europe than that of Communism pretending to be a dissipator of illusions. Communism, for example, stokes up indignation with Christianity for being 'the opium of the people'. It has taken Europe one hundred years to arrive at the point of beginning to suspect—*only beginning*, please note—that of all the 'dope' by which the masses of Western civilization have been drugged into insensate mental sloth, the greatest dope of all is that of Communism. 'Religion', said Marx, 'is the opium of the people.' The time has come, not only to 'talk of cabbages and kings', but to say, with brutal clarity, that Communism is the hashish of the intelligentsia and the most gigantic deception of the masses in all human history. Communism is a compendium of lies, which have deceived many of the elect! Let me concentrate here on one of these lies. I call it 'The Great Lie of Communism'.

### I

For a hundred years Communism has pretended, and pretended most successfully, that its deepest and most passionate concern has been its care for the



poor and under-privileged; its great determination to emancipate the poor, not only from their poverty, but from bondage of every kind, and, above all, from the political tyranny of the State. This has been, in the mouths of its leading prophets from Marx and Engels onwards, its master-cry: the inspiration of its bitter, slashing criticism of all *bourgeois* and social-democrat parties and elements, who combined in exploiting the poor and downtrodden, whose champion and Messiah is Communism. If the reader is anxious for documentary confirmation of this, let him read *The Communist Manifesto*. Better still, let him read Part VIII (on primitive accumulation of capital) of Marx's *Capital*, pp. 784-834, (in the Charles Kerr edition). The red-hot indignation expressed in these pages at the wrongs of the poor is equalled in the pages of Lenin's voluminous work. Read, for example, *The Deception of the People* (Martin Lawrence, London).

As speak the masters, so also the disciples, down to the little tyros who can just about string a few of the 'sacred' words together, like 'exploitation', 'capitalist blood-suckers', 'social-democratic vermin' whose role, of course, is to deceive the masses, thus making their exploitation by the capitalist easier. And so on *ad nauseam*. Communism is the hope of the poor and enslaved. It carries the torch of liberty for the oppressed. The Communist Party is supremely the party of the working-class. All other political parties are frauds and shams, promising reforms and benefits to the poor only to deceive them and oppress them more than ever. In the name of the poor and the dispossessed Communism has butchered and lied, deceived and oppressed, and brought terror to a new pitch of efficiency. All this and more has Communism done under the cloak of idealism—the idealism of saving the poor.

Quite apart, of course, from the humbug of this attitude, both conscious and unconscious, it should be pointed out that this attitude of the passionate championship of the poor is a ludicrous philosophical contradiction in Communism. Historical Materialism claims to be an objective philosophy of history, as dispassionate a demonstration of historical fact as Darwinism is of biological development. History is a dialectical process motivated by class-struggle, in which classes dominate only so long as they serve and promote the cause of historic development. When they cease to perform this function, they are elbowed off the stage of history by the revolutionary dynamic of the new, rising class. Communism claims the status of a science for its historical theory. That is to say, *it cannot be wrong*. What Historical Materialism does is merely to expose the necessary mechanics of historical development.

Since, then, Communism presumes to be an objective historical science, all passion and moral indignation are hopelessly out of place. You do not get angry with lightning and thunder for all the devastation they cause. They are objective, natural forces. Neither do you get angry, *as a good Marxist*, with capitalist exploitation, which is one of the mechanics of historical development. It would be just as sensible to become lyrical in praise of the Capitalist class because, *in Marxist theory*, it stimulates the development of the working-class. Both praise and blame are grossly un-Marxist and unscientific.

Both that offers no difficulty to Communism. Intellectual inconsistency is the least abhorrent of its features. In the pursuit of power, Communists have never hesitated to exploit both virtue and vice for the promotion of their interests.

It is this fact which supplies the key to the understanding of the supreme Communist pretence of concern for the poor and the social outcast.

Communists have only one passion, and that is the passion for power. Nothing is easier than to prove the truth of this statement. Personal biography and political history proffer overwhelming evidence. If the unerring test of the truth of what men *say* is to be found in what they *do*, then Communism is finally condemned. Let me offer, very briefly, two examples—one biographical and the other historical.

(1) Karl Marx had a mania for power, which made him one of the most disagreeable men in modern history.<sup>1</sup> He quarrelled with everybody except Engels, who always agreed with him. He was one of the founders of the First International, the control of which he kept jealously in his own hands. It was precisely in his relations with his fellow-revolutionaries that he revealed his power-mania. So great did this become that, in the end, when Bakunin, the anarchist, appeared to be gaining control of the International, Marx did not hesitate to destroy the International rather than see it under any control other than is own. Beneath all the grandiose jargon of his theorizing, he positively lusted for power. He insisted on uncritical submission from everybody. Those who refused he defamed and libelled and did all he could to destroy. The totalitarian State is the perfect political reflection of Marx's character. As Schwarzschild says of him, Marx's socialism was 'Prussia minus the Ten Commandments'.

(2) My second example (out of thousands) is the contemporary attitude of Stalin and his *junta* toward a fellow-Communist dictator, Tito of Jugo-Slavia. Being an adherent of Communist theory offers no protection whatsoever to a ruler if he fails to give one hundred per cent obedience to the ogre of the Kremlin. *Stalin does not hesitate for a single moment to do all he can to destroy a Communist State which he cannot control.* The right theory goes for nothing. Power is the only reality for Communism.

Since power is the supreme End, Communism becomes utterly amoral and unscrupulous in subordinating everything and everybody in its drive for power and in its determination to maintain power when achieved. Idealism becomes a tactic in the struggle for power, to be discarded when it has served its turn. Passion for the poor, for Communism, is absolutely nothing more nor less than a propagandist device. Communists care nothing for the poor, whom they destroy without compunction if they cut across the will to power. In Italy, Communism promises the moon to the poor. In Russia, Communism showers privileges and wealth on the bureaucrat and the technician whose support is a necessity for the maintenance of the ruling class in power.

## II

This analysis of Communism is amply borne out by the record of Communism in power. In Russia, the Bolsheviks have been in power for a longer time than any other Government in the world today! They have wielded power greater than any ever known since 1917—a period of thirty-three years. This era

<sup>1</sup> If the reader desires to pursue this study in detail, he can consult Prof. E. H. Carr's *Karl Marx* (Dent, 1934), Franz Mehring's classical biography, *Karl Marx* (John Lane, The Bodley Head, 1936), and Schwarzschild's *The Red Prussian* (Hamish Hamilton, 1947).

constitutes the greatest bloodbath ever known in all man's tragic story. It is an era in which the greatest sufferers have been exactly the poor. Under Communism, the poor have remained poor; their liberties have declined; their exploitation by State capitalism has been more ruthless and degrading than that exercised by private, individual capitalism at its worst; their de-humanization has been more rapid and thorough. Under Communism, the masses have become the property of the State to a degree never realized before. They have sunk to the status of slaves. The Soviet Government is the one and only Government known to history that has *restored* the institution of slavery. Czar Alexander abolished serfdom. Stalin reinstitutes chattel slavery, which is socially more reactionary than serfdom itself.

The history of the Soviet régime can only be made intelligible by realizing that everything is subordinated to power. The enormous disproportion between light and heavy industry is determined, not by the welfare of the people, but by the vested power-interests of the Government. This reflects itself in the extreme economic inequalities of Soviet society. The gulf between the lowest paid workers in Russia and the highest salaried officials is greater than in any capitalist country in the world.<sup>2</sup> This is the reality of Communism in power. It sells the poor for less than 'a pair of shoes'.<sup>3</sup>

It is, of course, not at all necessary to assume that, in the case of individual Communists, the concern for the poor is always a deliberate deception, a 'conscious' pretence. The modern psychology of the unconscious has familiarized us with the concept of the 'unconscious' pretence, which is inherent in the process of rationalization. This thing called 'rationalization' is twice cursed. It deceiveth him who does the rationalizing as well as the community that has to endure the results of the rationalizing. Our basic motives we nearly always seek to hide from society, and in order to do that, we have to hide them from ourselves. So we pursue the will-to-power whilst persuading ourselves that we are being moved by altruistic compassion. There is no more conclusive demonstration of the truth of this statement than the rise and development of the modern Communist Movement.<sup>4</sup>

Even if we admit that many of the early recruits of Marxist Communism (like Moses Hess, Arnold Ruge, and the Left Hegelians) were sincere in their zeal and crusading for the poor, it ought not to be difficult to understand that, as Communism develops, especially after achieving power, the pretence of championing the under-dog becomes increasingly difficult to maintain. One of the most inveterate of self-deceivers was Lenin. But even his 'pose' was shaken (though not destroyed) when, on the morrow of achieving supreme power in 1917, Lenin shot down the Kronstadt sailors who had hoisted him to the seat of power. It drove him to institute N.E.P. (the New Economic Policy, which was a partial restoration of Capitalism). But that was all. The actual record of Communism in power destroys the myth of Communist passion for the under-dog. The only people who can still be taken in with this pretence are those who want to be deceived. And they come into a different category

<sup>2</sup> Vide *Inside Red Russia*, by J. J. Maloney (Angus & Robertson, Sydney, 1948).

<sup>3</sup> Amos.

<sup>4</sup> Considerable confusion is caused by relating Marxist Communism to medieval Communism, as certain ecclesiastics are prone to do. The medieval Communism of Piers Plowman was Christian. Marxist Communism is a product of Industrialism plus Secularism and bears no relation whatever to medieval Communism. The only thing in common between them is the term 'Communist'.

altogether. The 'fellow-travellers' present a moral and psychological problem of peculiar perversity. For the present I am concerned with normal, not abnormal, people. Normal men and women of sound instinct can no longer believe in the Great Communist Lie.

From this fact it is necessary to draw conclusions.

With its terrible record of oppression and cruelty and brutal indifference to the welfare of the masses, normal people, who are permitted free access to news and opinion, will not be deceived by Communist claims to be the champion of the unprivileged. The combination of the lowest standard of living of all civilized peoples together with the highest volume of slave labour can deceive only highly educated secularized people. It cannot deceive people of earthy common sense, whose intelligence has not yet been corrupted by so-called educational processes.

Therefore, do not perpetuate the error that improvement of social and economic conditions is a bulwark against Communism; that high wages are automatically a dissolvent of Communism. Do not perpetuate the error that mass poverty predisposes to Communism. *The primary condition for the encouragement of Communism is not economic, but moral and spiritual.* It inheres, not in any system, but in men's souls. *Communism appeals only to completely secularized minds; to minds in which the abandonment of Christian faith has left a moral and spiritual vacuum.* Just consider two contemporary facts.

First: there is probably greater poverty in Eire than in any country in Western Europe except Spain and perhaps Italy. But in no country is there less Communism. How can you square that fact with the delusion that poverty breeds Communists in the world of today? A snowflake has a better chance of surviving in the tropics than Communism has of winning the Irish peasantry and masses. In spite of their poverty, their Christian faith makes them immune to the disease-germ of Communism.

Second: it is among the workers enjoying the best conditions in Western Europe (e.g., France, Italy, England) that Communism gets its best recruits. How does the Bishop of Chichester account for that?<sup>5</sup> Look at the Trade Unions which harbour Communists—the Miners, the Engineers, the Electrical Trades. These constitute the aristocracy of the working-class. But their superior conditions do not immunize them against Communism. There is no mystery at all here. They are instances of the complete departure from Christian faith so characteristic today of a certain section of the industrial masses. This is even truer of the industrial workers of France. It is never the *Lumpen Proletariat* that recruit the Communist Party.

This analysis must not be construed into an argument for the perpetuation of bad social conditions. Improve them all you can, especially the 'coolie' standards of the Asiatic masses which are on a par with the conditions of the masses in Russia. But do not let us deceive ourselves and others, especially others, that by raising wages, reducing hours of work, improving housing, and so on, we are thereby defeating Communism. By social conditions alone we shall do nothing to devitalize or defeat Communism. Indeed, we may well

<sup>5</sup> In a letter to *The Times* of 21st August 1950 the Bishop lent the weight of his authority to the fallacy that it is bad social conditions that produce Communism. I protested at the time. The Dean of Chichester (the Very Rev. W. Duncan-Jones) registered a powerful protest against his Bishop in a letter he wrote also in *The Times* a few days later.

stimulate it. Is it poverty of purse that afflicts the lawyers, technicians, scientists, authors, artists, and parsons (the most perverse and bizarre of the lot), who make up the nauseous crew of 'fellow-travellers' in Western Europe? I throw not, as the great Bacon would put it. Their need lies in another region entirely.

Lenin was fond of saying that Marxism was the consummation of European culture.\* In fact, Marxism is the corruption of European culture. It is philosophy in a state of decay. It is the late fruit of the long post-Renaissance process of secularization, which (a) begins by secularizing Christian dogma and (b) finally destroys it. Having divested human existence of a whole dimension of being, Marxism emerges as the embodiment of a truncated, superficialized view of life, cosmos, and man. Communism can appeal only to those for whom the potentialities of existence are confined within time and matter. That is the tap-root of the Communist fungus, not poverty and bad social conditions and all the rest of the delusions so dear to a generation that has identified 'the good life' with increasing consumption of mere things.

D. R. DAVIES

\* e.g. in his *Marx, Engels, Marxism* (Martin Lawrence), p. 7.

## THE HUMANITY OF EDEN PHILLPOTTS

HOW MANY books and plays Eden Phillpotts has written during his long life it would be hard to say, but his output has been prodigious. Yet, unlike most writers, he had no definite leanings toward literature, and only became a writer after unsuccessful efforts in other directions.

There is a tendency to associate writers with a certain locality and Eden Phillpotts will always be linked with Devon. Yet he was born in India, long ago in 1862, and came to England when only two years old. After going to school in Plymouth he went to London at the age of seventeen to become a clerk in an office, where he remained for ten years. How often during those ten years must his thoughts have strayed to the hills and valleys of his beloved Devon. He attempted both Art and the Stage before becoming a free-lance journalist.

Recognition came to him slowly, for his fame was of no mushroom growth. His earliest novels received scant attention. Perhaps he first enjoyed popular success with his 'Human Boy' stories. These were written when he worked on the staff of the *Idler* under Robert Barr and Jerome K. Jerome.

Eden Phillpotts is a writer of remarkable versatility. Novels, short stories, plays, detective stories, and poems have all poured from his prolific pen. This versatility has in the past caused him to be underrated, for there is popular distrust of a man who does many things and does them all well. Today he is rated at his true value, and most authors would consider that they had made a successful career if they equalled Eden Phillpotts in even one of the many directions in which he has found fame.

It has been inevitable that Eden Phillpotts should be compared with Thomas Hardy. Both men took their characters from the peasantry and dealt with



those people who are close to mother earth, and many critics have been unable to mention the name of one author without dragging in that of the other. How unfair this has been. There is really no resemblance whatever between their work, apart from some superficial likeness in characters and setting.

Hardy is a pessimist, portraying humanity struggling, usually in vain, against an overpowering and malignant destiny. There is little humour in Hardy. On the other hand, Eden Phillpotts is surely an optimist. There is conflict in his books, there is grim drama, but there is also kindness and warmth and laughter. There is never any suggestion of a blind fate working destruction. Rather we see retribution following on human folly and wickedness. A man reaps what he sows.

Yet in almost every line that Eden Phillpotts has written we can find the essential kindness of the man himself. He is a man keenly interested in humanity and loving humanity, sympathizing with its failures and tolerant of its follies. We can see that he is sympathetic toward human frailty and is more ready to help than condemn.

In any survey of the writings of Eden Phillpotts, we become aware that the author has two loves—love of people and love of his countryside. It is significant that at no time is the Devon scene used as a mere backcloth for his dramas. Always his characters seem to develop naturally in their surroundings. The late Arnold Bennett summed this up admirably. 'He puts humanity down to its proper place in the whole scheme of things. And that scheme is an orderly scheme. In other words, for him there is a scheme, and he takes it seriously, he takes it emotionally.'

There is little doubt that we find the finest flowers of Eden Phillpotts's genius in the great Devonshire Cycle, a vast work of eighteen novels that took more than a quarter of a century to write. The first book in the cycle was *Children of the Mist* and the last was *Children of Men*, and the novels cover an amazing range of characters and nearly every part of Devon, with only about three exceptions. The first novel in the series has for its setting the village of Chagford, and the book contains a vivid description of the local celebrations on the occasion of Queen Victoria's Jubilee. There is one comedy novel in the cycle, *Widdicome Fair*, with action laid in the locality famous for Tom Pearce's old grey mare and old Uncle Tom Cobleigh and all. *Orphan Dinah* takes place in the quiet and lovely Vale of Dart.

This strange countryside, with its secluded villages, its pleasant rivers, and its grim desolate moorland, is the setting for many of the Phillpotts novels. The impression that Dartmoor made is shown in many of his pages, although possibly the following passage from *The Whirlwind* is his finest tribute. 'Rivers roar a requiem; and their inevitable dirge is neither joyful nor mournful, but only glorious. The singers also are mortal; the wind and the wave are creatures, even as the perishing heath, crumbling stone, and falling foliage—they too are a part of the only miracle of the universe, the miracle of matter made manifest in pomp and wonder, in beauty and mystery, where Nature rolls her endless frieze along the entablature of time.' This is fine writing.

Eden Phillpotts has the great gift of accurate description. As we turn his pages we can see his landscape in all its majestic beauty. In the same way do his characters spring to life. What sort of people does Eden Phillpotts describe?

In the main they are shrewd, honest country-folk, with good humour and kindliness. The words that their creator puts into their mouths are always the right words. Probably the best-known book in the Devonshire Cycle is *The Mother*, and here Eden Phillpotts has created an immortal character, and one which lingers in the memory long after the last page has been read. *The Mother* portrays a living, noble type of womanhood, and one may, perhaps, wish that some of the younger writers, in their frenzied search for realism, would discover that nobility of character is as real as wise-cracking smartness, and that dawn is as real as a drain.

In the 'Human Boy' stories, many of us are taken back to our schooldays, when we trembled at the headmaster's frown. The Dr. Dunstan of these stories, with his pompous phrases, contains something of everybody's headmaster.

The art of the detective story is a difficult and complex one, and most writers of this type of fiction are specialists. Yet, just as the detective story is read by bishops and cabinet ministers, so it is often attempted by authors whose work usually lies in a different direction. Eden Phillpotts has written a number of detective stories, and like everything else undertaken by this amazing veteran of letters, they are in the very highest class. In fact, he has been referred to as one of the few living masters of this difficult craft. His detective stories, like his other works, are characterized by their admirable technique. A problem is posed, an obstacle has to be overcome. In the conclusion everything is neatly and logically rounded off, and there are no loose ends to irritate the reader.

Many people know Eden Phillpotts best through his plays, and probably best of all through *The Farmer's Wife*. This delightful comedy, in spite of a doubtful start, was a triumphant and record-breaking success in the theatre, and was the play that first gave an opportunity to Sir Cedric Hardwicke. Although written for the theatre, this play has reached a much wider public through the medium of the radio, and many people who have never read a line that Phillpotts has written have still been able to smile at Churdles Ash and Thirza Tapper.

*Yellow Sands*, written in collaboration with his daughter, Adelaide Eden Phillpotts, has been another great success on stage and radio. In these two plays we see how ably he deals with real people and we can perceive the fundamental humanity with which he portrays the joys and sorrows, the laughter and the tears that go to make this life.

But for the best of Phillpotts we must turn to his books, to the pages that may be read in quietness and ease. Here, at our own leisurely pace, we may walk across Dartmoor, see it in all its moods, and mingle with those people who lived and breathed in that wild countryside. It is part of his belief that man, and especially the rural and more primitive man, is very much a child of nature, affected greatly by the temper of the elements and the changing mood of the seasons. Man, he asserts, is a creature of his environment, and everyone with any knowledge of social conditions is bound to agree with him. It is true that sometimes a diamond is found on a garbage heap, but usually an unhappy, unwholesome environment is a vital factor in the creation of human misery and degradation. The importance of environment on human affairs and human character was well known to Eden Phillpotts. 'We may incarnate the seasons and set them moving, mighty and magic-fingered, upon the face of the earth,

to tell a story laden with unsleeping activities, mysterious negations and frustrations, battles and plots, tragedies and triumphs.'

Among so much fine work it is difficult to single out any one book for special praise. *The Mother* is probably the best known with its admirable portrayal of the unselfish maternal instinct, but for sheer artistry perhaps *The Whirlwind* is his greatest novel. It was written in 1907 and is a splendid example of his craftsmanship on its highest level. The book has a skilfully manipulated plot and there are only three important characters, which are drawn with the sure hand of the master. But it is by its conflicting emotions that the book commands the attention of the reader, for we find the opposition of morbid ill-health and glowing animal vitality, and the antagonism of scepticism and religious belief.

This element of conflict and contrast occurs frequently in the pages of the Dartmoor novels. In *The Beacon* we find Lizzie Denster, a woman accustomed to the life of cities, set in strong contrast to the shrewd placid men and women of the villages. A conflict of a different kind is found in the *Children of Men*. Here we have a farmer, Jacob Bullstone, kind, honest, and aloof. He marries Margery Huxam, a superior type of kennel-maid, and all life seems to be smiling on him. But he carries within him that fatal germ of jealousy, that torments him unceasingly. Although his jealousy is unfounded, it ruins his life and destroys him from within. All through the empty years, when his children had grown up, he still nursed that bitter jealousy that brought him ridicule, censure, and tragedy.

Eden Phillpotts, the writer of detective stories, has displayed a mastery of plot that reduces many practitioners of this craft to the level of stumbling beginners. What is more, his use of English is a delight, after reading the slipshod style of the average writer of 'thrillers'. Possibly his most exciting story is *A Voice from the Dark*, which he wrote at the age of sixty-three. A retired detective, John Ringrose, is on holiday at a Dorset inn, and is awakened one night by the ghostly voice of a child. From this beginning John Ringrose discovers that a crime has been committed and he even finds out by whom it has been committed. But he has not the slightest shred of evidence. The brilliant working-out of this story keeps the reader in a state of breathless excitement.

From this it will be seen that Eden Phillpotts can discard the familiar technique of the 'whodunit'. In more conventional vein we have *The Red Redmaynes*, which has plenty of mystery and a satisfying denouement.

On occasion, our versatile author makes an excursion into fantasy, and here we see his delightful humour and whimsical kindliness. *The Lavender Dragon* is the story of the brave knight who rides forth to slay the dragon—but with a difference. For the dragon is a vegetarian and all the people under his sway are quite contented with their lot. In fact, the dragon's one aim is to keep all his captives happy and smiling.

No survey of the work of Eden Phillpotts would be complete without a reference to his poetry. In this, as in all things, he is modest and deprecating, and said of himself that he was no poet. And yet, how memorable are some of his lines, how vivid his word pictures.

*The vague of dusk, with trim and starry sleight,  
Bade fern-owl purr and trimmed the glowworm's light.*

Although he portrays natural scenery as admirably in his verse as he does in his prose, yet here again his interest is in people. In one of his poems called *Fire Faces* he speaks of an old man gazing into the fire.

*Then smiled one shadowy face and grey  
That stabbed to the nerve of a passion old,  
Beside the fire it grew very cold,  
And he turned away.*

A study of Eden Phillpotts's poetry is well worth while, for he, like most writers, reveals himself most clearly in his verse. And what manner of man is Eden Phillpotts? We can see from his works that he is a lover of nature in her wilder moods. He is a lover of humanity and, even more, he is a sympathetic student of humanity. Here is no cold analytical mind, no unemotional eye that peers down a microscope, unmoved by the lives and deaths of the creatures that he sees. It is of particular interest to read what he says about his own work. Eden Phillpotts tells us, quoting from Nietzsche, that 'I have tried to say "yea" to life, even in its most difficult problem, and to display a will to life, rejoicing in its own vitality in the sacrifice of its highest types'.

Of the man himself, apart from the writer, little is known. Throughout his long life he has shunned publicity, and never sought the limelight. Always he has preferred to let his books speak for him. One thing stands out in his life and this might have been suspected by any student of his works. He has a passionate love of flowers and shrubs, and indeed might be called an expert on the growing of flowers. His interests in this direction are as wide as his literary interests, yet he has confessed to a special fondness for one group of flowers—the irises. He writes about flowers with the same vivid power that he uses to describe the granite moorlands of Dartmoor.

Writing of a group of irises from the Near East, he tells us: 'These kings and queens go adorned in robes of black and silver, rose and gold, funereal *crêpe*, and festive purple and azure; they wear wonderful furs also, magically stained and coloured like the bodies of humble bees; while their petals are as the wings of great fairy butterflies whereon the little people have written their secrets. The loveliness of these flowers is mingled with mystery; they waken strange thoughts; they shared his rock calvary with Prometheus.'

In Eden Phillpotts we have one of the most versatile writers, not merely of our own times, but of all time. He has suffered for his versatility and there is no doubt that had he been content to specialize he might have achieved even greater recognition than he has done. But throughout all his work we can sense his essential humanity, his warm love for his fellow creatures, and paralleled with this is his passionate devotion to wild nature and his own much-loved countryside. His humour is always kindly, his satire always gentle and never malicious, his work always marked with the deepest sincerity.

Looking back over his long life he must feel well content with his work. Keeping within a narrow compass, he has plumbed the heights and depths of human emotion, he has given us laughter and tears, and with all this, a series of enthralling novels that hold the reader's attention from the first page to the last. He has given us a vast range of characters, people who live in his pages, who spring into pulsing life at his words. Perhaps of all his characters, his best

types are his women. How admirably does he portray those wise sympathetic women—women like the mother in the novel of that name. One feels how deeply Phillpotts himself admires women of that type and there is no doubt that he has in his own nature much of that human understanding that he reveals in the children of his fertile imagination.

One hesitates to use the word 'genius' in these days when it is applied so often and so easily. But what other word can do justice to Eden Phillpotts? He has surely carved his niche in the temple of fame and future generations will do him reverence. He has written, sincerely and supremely well, of life—the life of the countryside and the life of his fellow men. He has shown us the sublimity of ordinary people and the greatness of every day.

CARTWRIGHT TIMMS

---

### THE IMPORTANCE OF FAITH IN HEALING<sup>1</sup>

JUST AS Medical Science is now much concerned with the psychological aspects of illness and the spiritual conflicts that affect disease, so the Christian Church as a whole has of recent years been reawakened to its historic mission as healer of the sick, and as 'exorcist of devils', and has been made aware that the healing of the bodies of men is not merely a matter of drugs and dressings, of medicine and mechanism, though these are necessary, but also a matter of a resolution of conflicts, and the forgiveness of sins. And it is here we meet the element of faith as the vehicle of therapy.

Nearly 500 years B.C., Socrates announced to his countrymen that the Thracian barbarians were well in advance of his Greek contemporaries in that they knew that the body cannot be cured without the mind. Hippocrates, the father of Medicine, said: 'In order to cure the human body, it is necessary to have a knowledge of the whole of things.' Bodily disease is not only a matter of virus and vascular disorder, of bacilli and blood, but also concerns thoughts and feelings, guilts and fears, will-power and faith.

Howard E. Collier, M.D., illustrates the interrelation of body, mind, and spirit, from the problems arising out of his own practice. He found that recovery from surgical attention and critical illness did not always march step by step with scientific explanation or with the prognosis of competent specialists. Indeed, the outcome of serious illness seemed to him to correlate significantly with the presence or absence of imponderable factors such as faith, hope, and charity. 'Contrary to all reasonable expectations, Mrs. Smith would be restored to the bosom of her family, whereas Mrs. Jones would die unexpectedly from some apparently trivial illness.'<sup>2</sup> This frequent occurrence led him to explore the 'imponderables' in health and disease as among the important data for the art of healing. Any student of Jung's psychology would agree that you cannot divorce bodily disease from either the psychopathology of the patient or from his religious faith. These three aspects of human personality—somatic, psychological, and spiritual—have no margin to separate them, they

<sup>1</sup> This article is the substance of a paper read to the Worthing Clinical Society, a group of physicians and surgeons.

<sup>2</sup> *Divine Healing and General Medical Practice* (S.P.C.K.), pp. 6f.



are inextricably bound together, and an 'illness' in the faith of a human being can as easily produce physical disease, as can a gastro-intestinal disease produce mental disturbance with suicidal trends on the one hand, or unyielding agnosticism on the other.

You may have heard of the incorrigible Mrs. Bateson whose husband always did more than justice to the delightful roast pork she provided for his Sunday dinner. But immediately afterwards, Mr. Bateson would be constrained to make his way to his bedroom to 'engage in prayer with the Lord'. Sometimes this 'wrestling with his Maker' persisted for two hours or more, in which case Mrs. Bateson would administer a strong dose of bicarbonate of soda. 'That soon put him right'—she would say, and the pious Mr. Bateson would emerge from his spiritual exercise like a giant refreshed. It is obvious that the state of the body affects the mind and spirit. The mind affects the body and the spirit, and the spirit affects both mind and body, and there are no frontier posts.

#### HISTORY<sup>3</sup>

Any discussion on the importance of faith in healing must of course have as its background the history of Faith Healing. Space forbids me to do justice to this absorbing subject, but I must point out a few of the relevant historical associations.

In the long history of man, religious faith and bodily healing have had a close association, until renaissance materialism and the growth of a scientific age brought an unnatural severance.

Today we consider that the majority of diseases are organismal in character. But this conception was quite foreign to the ancients. They believe disease to be due entirely, not to any internal cause, but to the action of supernatural beings of the unseen world. Such a conception still holds sway in the witchcraft of the Congo Belt and the Amazon. The need of the patient therefore was to get in contact with the gods and seek to expiate the sin, or atone for the evil cause, that relief might come. So the Greeks—intense lovers of bodily beauty and health—associated physical well-being with the worship of the gods of their Pantheon, and traced back the healing art to Apollo himself. More particularly, they made Aesculapius the object of worship, along with his daughters Hygeia and Panacea. The Roman world added little to what the Greeks had established, but the Jewish nation—borrowing a certain amount of Egyptian culture and hygiene, gave men in their *Torah*—books of the Law—fundamentally sound rules of health. Their medicines were very simple—saliva mixed with clay, oil, wine, salt, and sometimes a lump of fig to cure a boil. For the rest they believed in Yahweh their God—'I am the Lord that healeth thee'. Inevitably they associated disease with sin, and considered mental disturbance to be due to the action of evil spirits.

It was into this kind of environment that Jesus Christ came two thousand years ago. It has been the fashion during the past sixty years or so to question and minimize the ability of Jesus to cure disease. I can only say here, that fifty years of the most searching and merciless Biblical Criticism proceeding

<sup>3</sup> In this brief historical survey, I quote freely from Geo. S. Marr: *Christianity and the Cure of Disease* (Allenson).

from the universities of this country and Germany have failed to disturb the substantial historicity of the Gospels in the New Testament, and as a result of research, we have much clearer historical and literary evidence for the life and ministry of Jesus Christ than for the life and ministry of Plato! The miracles of healing portrayed in the Gospels include cures effected on the special senses—deafness, dumbness, blindness. Jesus healed ‘a withered hand’, a case of paralysis, and at least two cases of nervous origin, which, according to one authority in medicine were probably tabes dorsalis and anterior poliomyelitis. Several cases of leprosy are mentioned—though the leprosy referred to in the New Testament might well have been psoriasis or eczema. The ‘issue of blood’ may have been interine fibroid, says Dr. Marr,<sup>4</sup> and the fever of Peter’s mother-in-law was probably malaria. The people healed of ‘evil spirits’ were probably victims of either neuroses or psychoses. Jesus appears to have made some use of the medicines of his time, water, oil, saliva, and to have laid his hands on the patient to give confidence. But the main factor of these cures was the element of faith which released unseen energy and enabled harmony to be restored to the diseased and broken body. Faith in these cases was the opening the whole spirit to God, the devoting of the entire personality—reason, memory, emotion, imagination, intuition, love—into a channel of communication with God.

After the death of their Master, the apostles perpetuated these wonders. Peter cured the lame man at the gate of Jerusalem. Paul cured a cripple at Lystra, and when in Ephesus ‘unto the sick were carried away from his body handkerchiefs or aprons, and the diseases departed from them, and the evil spirits went out’ (Acts 19<sup>11-12</sup>). The Apostle James left this injunction for the Early Church: ‘Is any sick among you? Let him call upon the elders of the church; and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord: and the prayer of faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up’ (James 5<sup>14</sup>).

There is no lack of evidence to show that ‘healing by faith in the name of Jesus’ was an integral part of the Church’s activity during the first three centuries of the Christian era. Irenaeus and Justin Martyr both make references to the practice, as do Tertullian and Origen. Eusebius, in his *Historia Ecclesiastica*, written in Constantine’s reign, gives the written evidence of Quadratus, who, writing in A.D. 125, affirmed that some of the people cured by Jesus and the Apostles were still alive at that time.

After Constantine’s time, the Parabolani—groups of Christians who cared for the sick—came into evidence, and the Nestorians—pioneer missionaries of the faith in India and China—emphasized the work of the care and cure of the sick. Church hospitals sprang up in all large towns in the fifth and sixth century. Hospitals and hospices like that of St. Bernards in Switzerland were administered by monks who cultivated herbs for the treatment of disease. In early medieval times there grew up a cult of faith-healing or ‘theurgic-therapy’ based on belief in the miraculous healing power of saints and holy relics. Shrines of healing were set up at points throughout Europe similar to those at Bury St. Edmunds and St. Thomas at Canterbury, made famous by Chaucer’s immortal *Tales*. In much medieval practice there appears to have been an

<sup>4</sup> *ibid.*, p. 29.

admixture of flagrant chicanery and superstition, and this increased as the Church became more corrupt. But here and there we have evidence that wonders took place. Gibbon, in his *Decline and Fall*, in setting forth five causes to explain the phenomenal growth of the Early Church, gives as his third cause the miraculous powers of the Church; and undoubted sceptic though he was, he could not deny to the Venerable Bede in the eighth century, or St. Bernard in the twelfth century, the same confidence that he gave to the early Christian Fathers.<sup>5</sup> Of healing in the early centuries of Christianity, however, this ought to be said—that the cures effected by faith were predominantly—though not exclusively—those in which there was a strong emotional element—in fact, those diseases which today would be labelled 'neurotic' and 'psychosomatic'. And it is obvious that as we recede from primitive Christianity, instantaneous cures become very rare, and are substituted by the medieval equivalent to hospital attention, and the use of medicaments, though all this is still done under the auspices of the Church.

The Protestant Reformation brought a change of attitude. The worship of images and the veneration of relics of saints, were among the abuses tackled by the reformers. But their zeal appears to have carried them beyond the limits of necessity, and to have led them to serious neglect in their care for the body. The Reformers gave outstanding prominence to the doctrines of 'Faith' but owing to the abuses connected with the healing of the body in previous centuries, they concentrated their whole attention on faith's power to heal the *souls* of men. The body of man, in Reformation theology, was quite subsidiary, and was even looked upon with suspicion as the home of man's lusts and temptations. The Reformers were quick to teach 'Son thy sins are forgiven thee', but completely dropped the rest of the saying: 'Arise, take up thy bed and walk.'<sup>6</sup>

Perhaps as a reaction to this neglect, movements for divine healing have sporadically appeared during the past three centuries, but have had no permanent place until recently with the usually accepted protestant denominations. The *Journal of George Fox*, saintly founder of the Quakers, and the *Journal of John Wesley*, the creator of Methodism, give many instances of the prayer of faith bringing healing to the sick. Edward Irving in the nineteenth century (founder of the Catholic Apostolic Church) claimed wonderful success in reviving the power of the primitive Church in the cure of disease, and in America, about the same time, John Smith (who founded the Church of the Latter-Day Saints, the so-called 'Mormons') used the laying-on of hands for the healing of disease.

By far the most startling movement for the cure of disease by faith in God, is that started by Mary Baker Eddy, who founded in America the 'Church of Christ, Scientist'. This movement—'Christian Science'—belies its name, for it is neither Christian in its theology, nor scientific in its methods. Mrs. Eddy had many strange convictions. She denied, for instance, the reality of the material universe. Of course she was not alone in this. Hume, John Stuart Mill, Herbert Spencer also denied reality to matter, but for quite different reasons. But, by implication, Mrs. Eddy denied the functions of physical law, and so came to despise and deride the whole science of Medicine. There is no doubt that her tenets have brought an attitude to life that has tended to

<sup>5</sup> *Christianity and the Cure of Disease* (Allenson), p. 78

<sup>6</sup> *ibid.*, pp. 85-6.

alleviate the sufferings of many people, but the follies of Christian Science in relation to the medical profession have brought great and unnecessary tragedies in their train.

The Roman Catholic Church has maintained a consistent testimony through the centuries to the power of faith to heal. Lourdes—though not an ancient place of pilgrimage, it dates to 1858—sees still many thousands of pilgrims. Records show that the number of verifiable cures is very low, something like one in a thousand, though that leaves out of account the great mass of uncertain and unverifiable claims to cure. A similar place of pilgrimage exists at Carfin Grotto, near Glasgow. The cures, as ascertained, though not completely verified by Dr. Geo. S. Marr,<sup>7</sup> include a case of rheumatoid arthritis of the hip joint, long-standing varicose ulcer, septic eczema, a left-inguinal hernia, and infantile enteritis. The cures resulted simply from attendance at the grotto and prayer at the sacred spot after drinking the water.

Some good, and a great deal of harm has undoubtedly been done by the activities of so-called 'Faith-Healers' and 'Faith Missions'. They have shown without question that the power of God can play a part in the cure of disease, but their work is often ephemeral and impermanent; its healings are often superficial, and the methods employed are those of mass emotion and suggestion. Much suffering has resulted where the patients have opposed the advice of their doctors, and have thrown away medical care in favour of 'faith-healing'.

#### THE PRESENT POSITION

Mention must be made here of the widespread co-operation effected during this century between Medicine and the Church in the Overseas Missionary Movement, where medical science and the unseen power of God have been brought very near together. Take, for instance, the work of Dr. Howard Somervell. He gives the case of a man with serious tubercular trouble.<sup>8</sup> Dr. Somervell sent copies of the radiograph he had taken to one whom he regards as the greatest authority on bone diseases in India, if not in the East. Let me quote:

His answer was just as we had expected. The disease was tubercular, and the only chance of saving the man's life was to take off his leg at the knee. So we told the poor fellow that there was nothing else to be done. His reply was unexpected: 'Will you give me three weeks? I want to try the effect of praying about it.' We agreed to give him that time, and next day he went home. In three weeks he turned up true to his promise. He had left the hospital feverish, ill, flushed on the face, and only capable of being carried about. He returned in a car, but hobbling with a stick and looking much better. The wound in the leg was not healed, but the leg itself, as revealed by the X-rays, was wonderfully improved, though not yet free from the disease.

We were amazed. What had he done to make so great an improvement? He told us quite simply that he had been quite sure it was against the will of God for any of His servants to suffer, and that he had before him a life of service to God if only he could keep his life and his leg. So he called his family and friends together and said to them: 'Look here, will you folk unite in prayer for this leg of mine that it be completely healed?' They agreed, and for a week a continuous chain of prayer was kept up by that family. One of them would pray for a quarter of an hour. Then

<sup>7</sup> *ibid.*, p. 107.

<sup>8</sup> *After Everest* (pp. 274ff.), quoted by Leslie D. Weatherhead: *Healing through Prayer* (The Epworth Press).

another would take it up, and so on for over a week. In another three weeks, he came to see us again. The leg had healed. He was able to walk on it and appeared almost well. A few months later he was back at school, perfectly fit, playing games with the boys, running about on both legs with no sign of disease.

Dr. Somervell goes on to give us the example of a man with cancer of the cheek. He says the disease was so advanced that he declined to operate upon him. The patient went home to die. Then he remembered the power of God through prayer, and went to his local church and persuaded his fellow church-members to have frequent and united prayer that his cancer might be cured. I quote again:

Months later (says Dr. Somervell) I went to the branch hospital near to his place of abode, and a stalwart, healthy man with a healed scar on his cheek came to see me. The cancer, incurable by any method known to medical science except radium and X-rays, had completely disappeared. I confess that in my weakness of faith I was amazed, but of the original diagnoses there can be no doubt. If we in Neyyoor, where we see five or six hundred cases of cancer of the mouth every year, cannot diagnose a case of it, who can? Explain these cases how you like, by the power of mind over body, or by the intervention of God—the fact remains that their faith had been exercised in a way of which in our materialistic England we have no experience.

Many interesting experiments in healing by faith and healing by prayer are being carried out in this country today. It is well known that the Rev. Dr. Leslie D. Weatherhead sets aside a few minutes for special prayers for the healing of specific sick people every Sunday evening. He says: 'We have records of a fairly large number of cases where a definite turn for the better was made during the hour when prayer was offered, very often, when the patient has been quite unconscious that he was being prayed for.'

As far as the Anglican Church is concerned, the Lambeth Conferences of 1908 and 1920 expressed the need for much greater co-operation between those who care for the body and those who care for the soul. In 1944 Archbishop Temple called together a number of leading doctors and clergy, and in 1946 they widened their boundaries by incorporating the help of several other Christian denominations, and so there was founded the Churches' Council of Healing. This Council holds that healing should be approached from a three-fold standpoint—body, mind, and spirit—and that successful treatment in one is not possible without consideration of the others. It is interesting to note that in 1947 the Council of the British Medical Association gave the movement its blessing, and I quote here from a Supplement of the *British Medical Journal*:<sup>10</sup> It has become clear that this body is doing valuable work and that there exists a field for legitimate and valuable co-operation between clergy and doctors in general and between the Council of Healing and the Association in particular. The Council of the B.M.A. is of opinion that there is no ethical reason to prevent medical practitioners from co-operating with clergy in all cases and more especially those in which the doctor in charge of the patient thinks that religious ministrations will conduce to health and peace of mind or lead to recovery. Such co-operation is often necessary and desirable and would help to prevent abuses which have arisen through the activities of irresponsible and unqualified persons. Among other reasons the Churches' Council of Healing exists to safeguard the interests of those people who might become

<sup>9</sup> *Healing through Prayer* (The Epworth Press), p. 15.

<sup>10</sup> 8th November 1947, Vol. II, p. 112.



the victims of so-called faith-healers. Much harm has been done to individuals by unreasonable appeals to the emotions and by mass hysteria.

A central liaison has been established by the appointment of representatives of the Association to attend meetings of the Churches' Council and *ex officio* to serve on its Medical Advisory Committee. It is considered that most useful work may be done by close personal contact between doctor and clergyman, with an interchange of views and active co-operation where possible. With regard to the co-operation which can be secured at a Divisional or parochial level, it is considered that arrangements can best be left to the B.M.A. Divisions acting in concert with any branch organization of the Churches' Council or similar body. Joint activities might include the appointment of and co-operation with hospital chaplains and their deputies, education of the public, and informal discussions between doctors and the clergy.

#### CONCLUSION

One recognizes that the whole subject of faith in its relation to the healing of the body, must at times be very annoying to the doctor. Faith is elusive. You cannot pin it down. It does not care a rap for the laws of exact science. It does not yield to precise definition. It knows no frontiers. It refuses to be captured in a test-tube, and defies pathological examination. It has its counterfeits; it sometimes acts indiscreetly, and turns up in the most unexpected places. Yet when the reality of faith is there, it works miracles of healing in some cases, and where healing is denied, it gives the patient an inward resource that turns the rancour and frustration of disease into a fine philosophy of courage and patience.

To sum up, I want to lay down four postulates for your consideration:

(1) Healing by medicine and healing by faith should never be alternatives, but supplements to each other. To undertake the practice of medicine without an appreciation of the factor of faith, is to me as obscurantist as to treat blushing in every case as a form of dermatitis, hypertension, or alcoholism. And similarly for the healer by faith to act in opposition to medical practice and the laws of medical science is not only obscurantism, but is action in defiance of the goodness of God, for it is obvious that if God is Sovereign of His universe, He employs medical science as a healing agency. These two methods of healing should never be rivals, but partners, each recognizing that all healing finally comes from God. As Ambroise Paré, the famous French surgeon said: 'I dressed him, God healed him.'

(2) 'Healing by Faith' must be clear of the suggestion that God interferes in the laws of cause and effect to work His miracles, for such an idea suggests that if disease remains in the body there must necessarily be something deficient in the faith of the patient. God does not—according to our present limited knowledge of His activity—abrogate the laws of His own physical universe. At the same time, the physical universe is interrelated with the spiritual universe, and the laws of each affect the other. For instance, a bad conscience may affect a man's liver as surely as whisky, and a sense of guilt may paralyse man's motor mechanism as easily as an attack of infantile paralysis. It is obvious, then, that if the state of a man's conscience is treated, and if his burden of guilt is removed, one of the possible causes of his malady may be disposed of and his condition improved.

At the same time, the Healer by Faith must appreciate the self-limitations of

God. God has decreed laws of cause and effect which allow a great deal of suffering in the world which He, God, for His own divine reasons, will not diminish. In fact, God uses suffering as one of His educators, and it is often through suffering that we are brought face to face with the Unseen, and learn many of the most valuable lessons life has to give. The New Testament is quite clear on this point; that whilst God is able to cure different diseases, He is not willing in every case to bring healing. St. Paul (2 Corinthians 12<sup>7-10</sup>) prayed to the Lord thrice that his thorn in the flesh might be removed. But it remained and troubled him for the rest of his life. But he accepted it as the gift of God and made the discovery that God had resources of grace and strength such as he, Paul, had never imagined, and that God uses the weak things of the world to confound the mighty. God's strength is often made perfect in weakness; and faith, even where it does not bring healing, gives a philosophy that turns physical handicap from a liability to an asset.

(3) Any liaison between doctor and parson would be incomplete without the psychologist. You see there are patients who have vested interests in remaining unwell. They are scared of the responsibilities of being well and facing their problems. Like the man of whom it was said: 'He has enjoyed bad health for a long time, but now he complains of feeling better.'

Dr. J. L. Halliday,<sup>11</sup> declared that emotional states are the precipitating factors in asthma, peptic ulcer, hypertension, mucous colitis, exophthalmic goitre, and rheumatoid arthritis. The man who falls victim to colitis is one who invariably has an undue preoccupation with cleanliness and tidiness. The peptic ulcer patient is nearly always concerned about security and money. Patients suffering with coronary disease are usually the unremitting worker type with great personal ambitions,<sup>12</sup> whereas people with a highly developed sense of duty and self-sacrifice and stubbornness of principle are prone to rheumatoid arthritis. It is usual to find that eczema and prurigo patients and those afflicted with recurring migraine are personalities marked by mental and spiritual conflicts, and if the conflicts are resolved the disease often disappears. Dr. Flanders Dunbar in America has recently published the results of her researches on Psychosomatic diseases, and obviously reaches the same conclusions. She shows that illnesses which now stand at the top of the list of major causes of mortality and morbidity are illnesses in which we know emotion is particularly likely to be one of the chief etiological factors. They are not acute infections, as was the case fifty years ago, but rather accidents, and illnesses characterized by disorder of muscle tonus, secretion, or circulation, which are the most direct and primary responses to emotion.<sup>13</sup>

Men and women with fears, panics, conflicts, shocks, obsessions, compulsions, and psychosexual disorders, whose etiology goes back to early childhood, come to have the strangest hypochondriacal notions, and equally come to have distorted ideas concerning their faith, so that, on the one hand they go through agonizing somatic troubles that are really psychoneurotic in origin, and they experience false guilts and tormenting anxieties concerning their faith that no parson can unravel unless he has a psychological training. It seems obvious that in any liaison between the healer of the 'soma' (the doctor), and the

<sup>11</sup> *Psychosocial Medicine* (Heinemann), p. 62.

<sup>12</sup> *ibid.*, pp. 50-1.

<sup>13</sup> *Emotions and Bodily Changes* (Columbian University Press), p. xxxii.

healer of the spirit (the parson), there must also be a place for the healer of the 'psyche' (the psychologist).

(4) In conclusion, I feel the time has arrived for the doctor, the psychologist, and the parson to get together. In the matter of healing the sick, we use our own legitimate methods, but we are on the same job. The doctor ought to be free to call in the parson, and the parson ought to be able to call in the doctor on occasions, or the psychologist, as the case demands. As Dr. Halliday suggests, our British community is today a 'sick society', and we must find ways of co-operation to build up the true health, sanity, and well-being of the nation. Otherwise, sometime in the future a new Gibbon will rise to write *The Decline and Fall of the British Nation*.

As a first step, I believe it would be a good thing for like-minded doctors to meet like-minded parsons<sup>14</sup> to explore steps that could be taken together on the lines suggested by the Churches' Council of Healing. I am sure that free and frank exploration would before very long find its expression and consummation in the most useful therapeutic action.

C. EDWARD BARKER

---

<sup>14</sup> Readers might be interested to follow this line of thought in *Psychology in Pastoral Practice* by W. L. Northridge (Epworth Press, 5s.).

## AMERICAN METHODISTS AND THE OTHER CHURCHES

THE METHODIST CHURCH in the United States is not only the largest branch of the Methodist family in the world, it is also the largest single Protestant body in the United States. According to the latest statistics there are nearly nine million members in this main Methodist body, which was the result of a great unification movement which culminated in 1939 in the union of the Methodist Episcopal Church, the Methodist Episcopal Church South, and the Methodist Protestant Church. Besides some 300,000 Negro members in the united Methodist Church, there are also three strong Negro Methodist Churches which carry on independently. These are the African Methodist Episcopal with some 800,000 members; the African Methodist Episcopal Zion with more than 600,000 members; and the Coloured Methodist Episcopal with a membership of more than 300,000. Besides these larger Methodist bodies there are about 120,000 members in several smaller ones, making altogether an American Methodist family of about eleven millions.

At the end of the American Revolution, when independence had been won, the Methodists were the smallest and most humble religious body in the new nation, with a membership of some 15,000 enrolled in Methodist classes. A large majority of these early American Methodists were found in Maryland and Virginia, the colonies in which the Church of England had been strongest, and it is a significant fact that a majority of the early native American preachers came from families with an Anglican background.

### I

The largest religious bodies in America at the beginning of the National period of American history were the Congregationalists, the Presbyterians, the Baptists, and the Anglicans, and in that order. The Anglicans, or the Episcopalians as they are now called, although the most privileged body during the colonial period, and established by law in six of the colonies, at the war's end were in a depressed condition and in bad repute. Many of their clergy had been S.P.G. missionaries, and with the beginning of hostilities large numbers had returned to England, while many of those who remained were loyalists. For two generations after independence the Episcopalians passed through a period of suspended animation and therefore made a relatively small impact upon the new nation. The Congregationalists were a sectional body, confined almost entirely to New England, where they too were established by law. Although they had given almost a hundred per cent. support to the cause of independence nationally they were handicapped by their sectional character, while internal controversies and their failure to take a national view of their task limited their influence. Thus the two Churches which had occupied the most favoured position in the colonial period found themselves inadequately prepared to meet the peculiar problems of the new nation. Neither of these bodies today rank among the larger Protestant bodies; both, however, are important beyond their numbers and both still retain a more or less superior feeling because of their history and background.

The Presbyterians came next after the Congregationalists, both in numbers and prestige, at the beginning of the national period. Made up principally of people of Scots-Irish and Scottish background they had grown rapidly throughout the eighteenth century due to the flood of Scots-Irish immigration from North Ireland, and unlike the Congregationalists, they were well distributed throughout the nation. Both Congregationalists and Presbyterians had maintained relatively high educational standards for their ministry and together they had the educational leadership in the country. The Presbyterians, however, failed to maintain their numerical leadership largely because the rigidity of their doctrine and polity made it difficult if not impossible to adjust to the new conditions presented by population movements westward.

The Baptists, ranking third in number of congregations when independence was won, had grown rapidly from the middle of the eighteenth century onward, especially from Virginia southward, where they ministered most effectively to the more humble people, and to those living in the back country. They were also numerous in both the middle and New England States, and were the most active of all in their insistence upon their first great principle, complete freedom of conscience and the separation of Church and State. It is a significant fact that today two-thirds of all the Baptists in the world are found south of the Mason and Dixon line, and they have made by far the largest impact upon the Negro population of America.

The non-English speaking Churches, the Lutheran, the Dutch and German Reformed, and the several German sectaries, because of their language handicap and their clannishness made no attempt to minister to those outside their own linguistic groups and were therefore of little importance nationally speaking in the formative period of American history. As has been noted the Methodists were few in number and also localized in a few southern and middle States where they were gathered into thirty-seven circuits.

## II

The chief factor in determining which of the American Churches were eventually to be large and evenly distributed throughout the expanding nation, and which of them were to be small and confined to a limited area, was the way in which each met the problems posed by the vast movement of population westward, which by 1880 had filled in the whole continent from the Alleghanies to the Pacific slope. The Methodists and Baptists met this problem the most effectively, and this explains the fact that today these two denominational families are by far the largest among the Protestant bodies in the United States. The Presbyterians, in spite of the handicaps noted above, met the problems of the frontier more adequately than any of the other Churches with the exception of the Methodists and Baptists. By mid-century the numerical standing of the Churches in the United States had radically changed. The Methodists had grown from 15,000 in 1784 to 1,324,000 in 1850; the Baptists were next in order with 815,000 members; the Presbyterians were third with some 500,000, while the Congregationalists and Episcopalians occupied the fourth and fifth places respectively, the former with 192,000, the latter with less than 100,000.



The two Churches which had grown the most rapidly were those which made the largest appeal to common people. Both had utilized lay preachers extensively, while most of their regular ministry was made up of men without special educational training. After the formation of the Church of the Disciples in 1830 it too carried on with a ministry without special educational qualifications. On the other hand the Presbyterians, the Congregationalists, the Lutherans, the Episcopalians and the Reformed Churches maintained with a fair degree of success relatively high educational standards. The consequence was a sharp cultural cleavage between the Churches with the trained ministry and those with the untrained. The Churches with the trained ministry were naturally more doctrinally minded than were the Churches of the common people, since the less educated ministry stressed the simple Gospel and emphasized what they termed plain Gospel truths. The Churches with the educated ministry were also Calvinistic, which divided people into classes, the predestined to be saved and those doomed by divine decree to be damned. Such a gospel, naturally, had little appeal to the classless society of the American frontier, where equality was the charmed word. Here it was that the Baptist farmer-preacher and the Methodist circuit-rider gathered an abundant harvest of souls. The devoted Baptist farmer-preacher was pathetically weak in grammar and in his knowledge of 'divinity', but he knew the Bible by heart, and his zeal for spreading the 'simple' Gospel among the spiritually starved people of the West worked a transformation in many a community. Even more successful in dealing with frontier people were the Methodist circuit-riders who travelled vast circuits, and although many of them 'murdered the English language at every lick', to quote Peter Cartwright, yet their gospel of free grace and individual responsibility, which jibed with the common experience of the frontiersmen, swept innumerable sinners into the Methodist fold.

From the later years of the eighteenth century onward a whole series of revolts against Calvinism were in process in America. Arising out of differing social, economic, and religious backgrounds, these revolts varied all the way from a complete repudiation of Calvinism and all its implications on the one hand, as in the case of the Unitarians and Universalists, to varying degrees of modifications on the other. The rise of the New Haven theology through the dynamic teaching of Nathaniel W. Taylor, the first professor of Theology at Yale Divinity School, had far reaching effects in modifying both Congregational and Presbyterian Calvinism, eventually dividing both into Liberal and Conservative wings. The rise of the Cumberland Presbyterians and the Church of the Disciples in the West also had anti-Calvinistic implications. But the most insatiable opponents of Calvinism throughout the country were the Methodists, and whenever Methodists and Calvinists came together there was sure to be theological jousting. The Congregational and Presbyterian defenders of the Calvinistic position pretty generally looked with disdain upon their Methodist critics because of their lack of formal theological training, but the contest was not always as unequal as their differences in educational training might imply. Quickness of wit, thorough knowledge of the Scriptures and long practice in extemporaneous speaking rendered the Methodist preacher an effective defender of the Arminian faith. Then too on the frontier the Methodists had a natural advantage because of the very nature of frontier

experience. The Calvinistic position that man had little or nothing to do with his own salvation, made little sense to the frontiersman who knew only too well that his temporal salvation was in his own hands. The old Negro's explanation of the doctrine of election would have found hearty support among the western pioneers. When asked to explain that basic doctrine of Calvinism, the Negro stated it thus: There are three votes for every man's soul, God's vote, the Devil's vote, and the man's vote. If the man votes with God he is saved; if he votes with the devil he is lost; or in other words every man's salvation depends upon his own vote.

In 1835 Charles G. Finney, the greatest of the nineteenth-century American revivalists, and a New School Presbyterian later turned Congregationalist, in his lectures on 'Revivals of Religion' given in Broadway Tabernacle in New York, had this to say of the Methodists:

Look at the Methodists. Many of their ministers are unlearned, in the common sense of the term, many of them taken right from the shop or the farm, and yet they have gathered congregations and won souls everywhere. Wherever the Methodists have gone, their plain, pointed and simple, but warm and animated mode of preaching has always gathered congregations. Few Presbyterian ministers have gathered so large assemblies or won so many souls. . . . We must have exciting, powerful preaching, or the devil will have the people, except what the Methodists can save. . . . Many ministers are finding it out already, that a Methodist preacher, without the advantage of a liberal education, will draw a congregation around him which a Presbyterian minister with perhaps ten times as much learning cannot equal, because he has not the earnest manner of the other, and does not pour out fire upon his hearers when he preaches.

As Finney came more and more to approximate the Methodist theology, he more and more came under the criticism of the Calvinist bodies. The graduates of Oberlin College where he served as President until 1866, were barred from numerous Presbyteries and Congregational Associations, because of the Oberlin theology, particularly Finney's doctrine of perfectionism. But Methodist Arminianism and Methodist organizational influence were gradually leavening the beliefs and practices of the Calvinistic bodies, particularly in the West. On the other hand the Methodists were also gradually being influenced by the higher educational and cultural standards of the Presbyterians and Congregationalists, and to a less degree by the Episcopalians. Thus through the exertion of reciprocal influences the differences between the principal Protestant bodies in the United States were gradually growing less and less, which rendered an increased degree of co-operation a natural consequence.

### III

It was the need presented by the advancing frontier that first brought home to the American Churches the necessity of working together if the West was to be saved from semi-barbarism. The Camp-meeting is an early illustration of inter-church co-operation. It arose as an institution on the Kentucky frontier and had its origin among the Presbyterians when a Presbyterian revivalist, James McGready, in the Cumberland region in 1800 began to attract people from far and near by his vivid and pungent preaching. When people came

from such great distances that they could not return to their home the same day, out of necessity they remained overnight, camping out in the woods; and thus the Camp-meeting arose. The next year a camp-meeting was planned by another Presbyterian preacher, Barton W. Stone—later to become one of the co-founders of the Church of the Disciples—in a grove near one of his little log churches called Cane Ridge in northern Kentucky. Ministers and people of all denominations were invited. So many attended—variously stated at from ten to twenty thousand—that much confusion and emotional excitement resulted. To the more staid Presbyterians the whole performance seemed a travesty on religion, which led to its repudiation by most Presbyteries. From this time forward the Camp-meeting became almost exclusively an unofficial Methodist institution and in a remarkably short time it was made into an orderly, well-regulated, and useful instrument for western evangelization, constituting what Bishop Asbury called the Methodist harvest-time. It was, however, always an extra occasion in the economy of Methodism, always supplemental to the regular routine of the circuit-rider. By 1820 there were perhaps a thousand camp-meetings being held annually throughout the United States and for two generations it continued to perform a useful service both religiously and socially, especially in the newer sections of the country.

Although the camp-meeting became almost exclusively a Methodist agency, people of all communions attended, and not infrequently other ministers than Methodists participated. It also furnished an unusual opportunity for reaching the unchurched people, who in every frontier region far exceeded the Church people. Sinners were always attracted in great numbers, and many of them who came to laugh and indulge in practical jokes, remained to pray.

Although there were distinct differences in theology and polity among the various frontier Churches, which occasioned many public debates, yet as a whole their differences were less in evidence than their likenesses. Their religious diversity was underlaid with a certain degree of uniformity which made possible a unity of action and co-operation along many lines. On the whole, interest in theology was distinctly secondary to the practical and it was during this early period that the American evangelical Churches became distinctly activist. To the American, religion was more than passive acceptance of abstract conceptions, or the giving of assent to a formal creed. His theology was a theology that could be preached, that would influence everyday life and get things done. And he believed in co-operation, not only in temporal things but also in things religious.

The large number of interdenominational agencies which arose during the first third of the nineteenth century, such as the American Bible Society (1816), the American Tract Society (1824), the American Sunday-school Union (1826), and the American Temperance Society, are but typical of the time. The Plan of Union adopted by the Congregationalists and Presbyterians in 1801 which provided for the establishment of joint churches in frontier communities, resulted in the forming of many hundreds of such churches in central and western New York State, northern Ohio, southern Michigan and northern Illinois.

Another unifying influence stemming from frontier conditions was the adoption by all the more aggressive religious bodies of a common method of bringing the Gospel to the unchurched. This was revivalism. Even the Episcopalians, the Lutherans, and the Reformed Churches adopted modified revival methods, while the Methodists, the Baptists, the Disciples with the Presbyterians and Congregationalists became the revivalistic Churches *par excellence*. The revivalism of the Congregationalists and Presbyterians may have differed from that of the Methodists and Baptists in that it was perhaps less emotional in its appeal, but nevertheless, it was only a difference in degree, not in kind. It is a significant fact that the most widely known revivalists in the history of American revivalism have been either Congregationalists or Presbyterians. Although none of the eighteenth-century revivalists could match George Whitefield, the next greatest names were Jonathan Edwards, Congregationalist, and Gilbert Tennent and Samuel Davies, both Presbyterians. Nathaniel W. Taylor taught a revivalistic theology at Yale Divinity School and looked upon his work as a teacher primarily as that of training evangelists. Lyman Beecher believed in continuous revivals, and as President of Lane Theological Seminary made it a revival seminary. Charles G. Finney and Dwight L. Moody, the greatest of nineteenth-century revivalists, were both Congregationalists. So it was that all the aggressive Evangelical Churches in America early adopted a common method and approach in meeting the peculiar American problems. Through the years also, it has been the revivalistic Churches which have taken the lead in temperance reform and today they are in full accord on all moral questions.

#### IV

Culturally and educationally the American Methodists a hundred or more years ago occupied a lowly place. In the early years few of the educated and well-to-do were attracted to the Methodist fold. They were also slow in establishing schools for the training of their ministry. In fact it was not until 1831 that the American Methodists, after several unsuccessful attempts, finally succeeded in establishing a permanent college, Wesleyan University in Middletown, Connecticut. From that time on, however, the American Methodists entered upon a college-founding era unequalled by any other religious body, which by 1860 resulted in the establishment of thirty-four permanent colleges. Only the Presbyterians had founded more colleges—forty-nine—than the Methodists during these years, and since then the Methodists have far surpassed the Presbyterians. Other Churches were also busy founding colleges during these years: the Baptists 25; the Congregationalists 21; the Roman Catholics 14; the Episcopalians 11; and the Lutherans, Disciples, German and Dutch Reformed, Universalists, Unitarians, Quakers and United Brethren, all founded from one to six each. As these figures indicate, the American Protestant Churches dominated the whole field of higher education in America during the first half of the last century.

Practically all the colleges founded from independence to the Civil War were frontier institutions. In other words a great majority were founded when the country was in a new and undeveloped state; when the frontier people

were poor and unable to send their sons to the older institutions in the East. It was to meet this situation that the Churches determined to bring higher education to the West. Since the frontier period few colleges have been founded in the trans-Alleghany region, though the Churches continued to establish colleges as the population moved into the region west of the Mississippi. In the last fifty years, however, a great majority of the colleges and universities have been established in cities, in response to population movements into the great industrial centres.

Not a few of these little frontier colleges have developed into distinguished universities. Northwestern University, founded by the Methodists in Evanston, Illinois, is now one of the most richly endowed universities in the United States, as are also Duke and Emory Universities. Boston, Syracuse, the University of Denver and the University of Southern California were all established by the Methodists, and though not as richly endowed as the three mentioned above, have student bodies of great size, numbering many thousands each. Southern Methodist University, opened in 1915, has developed with amazing rapidity, and is now one of the major Church-related universities in the South. Many Methodist educational institutions of college grade rank with the best in the land. This all means that a Methodist cultural lag no longer exists. The new united Methodist Church requires a college education for all ministerial candidates entering an annual conference, while not a few of the conferences make the possession of a theological degree an additional requirement for membership.

This rapid cultural and educational transformation in American Methodism has created some serious and unfortunate results. Among them is the waning evangelical emphasis in Methodist preaching, and the alienation of people of the lower economic and social levels. This has led to the emergence of numerous holiness and pentecostal bodies, stressing conversion and continuous revivals. The Church of the Nazarene, the two Churches of God, the Assemblies of God, the Pilgrim Holiness Church, are but a few among many which have grown in recent years with astonishing rapidity. A practice not uncommon among the 'respectable Churches' is to belittle these revivalistic bodies; to call them such contemptuous names as 'holy rollers' and 'trouble-makers'. Some preachers have remarked that the only good purpose they serve is to drain the 'cranks' and 'fanatics' from their Churches; certainly an ungracious remark coming from Methodists whose none too remote ancestors were 'trouble-makers' of the same kind to the semi-moribund Churches of an earlier day. One of the most serious problems faced by all the American evangelical Churches is to find a way more adequately to minister to all levels of society.

The Methodists were among the last of the major American Churches to establish theological seminaries for the professional training of their ministers. Theological institutions in America date from the early years of the last century. The Presbyterians and Congregationalists with their tradition of a trained ministry led the way. Andover was opened by the Congregationalists in Massachusetts in 1808, after the professorship of Divinity at Harvard had been captured by the Unitarians in 1805. Princeton Seminary was established by the Presbyterians in 1812; the professorship of Divinity at Yale was expanded



into the Yale Divinity School in 1822. By 1836, the date of the founding of Union Theological Seminary in New York, the Presbyterians had opened five seminaries. The Lutherans founded their first seminary in 1826, the Episcopalians in 1819, the German Reformed in 1825. Both Baptists and Methodists opened their first seminaries in New England, the Baptists in 1824, the Methodists in 1846, which later became the Boston University School of Theology.

There was much opposition among Baptists, Methodists, and the Disciples to special theological seminaries. All held that no amount of theological learning could make up for the lack of a divine call. To preach the 'simple Gospel', they all maintained, did not require a long period of training in a theological school. As the Baptists put it: 'God never called an unprepared man to preach', though he has called many an uneducated one. To know Gospel truth as found in the Scriptures was enough. As the Disciples put it: 'Where the Bible speaks we speak, where it is silent we are silent'; and when they finally founded training-schools for their ministers they called them 'Colleges of the Bible', as most of them are still called. One pioneer Methodist preacher declared:

I have heard of wonderful things under the sun. I have heard that men take pure gospel seed and carry it to a 'theological mill' and get it ground into fine flour, and then sow it over the people and wonder why it does not spring up and bear fruit.

In the light of such opposition, what were the influences which finally led the Methodists to advocate and support special theological training for their ministry? In the first place a change in attitude came about as a result of the example of the Presbyterians and the Congregationalists. It is significant that both the Baptists and Methodists founded their first theological Seminaries in New England where Congregationalism dominated. A second influence was that exerted by the growing number of educated Methodist laymen who began to demand a ministry of which they need not feel ashamed. A trained ministry was needed, they affirmed, to attract and hold the better educated classes and also to defend the Methodists against attacks upon their theology.

The Methodist Church now maintains ten theological seminaries, one of which, Gamman in Atlanta, Georgia, is a training-school for Negro pastors. The ten seminaries have a combined enrolment of some eighteen hundred students. A college degree is required for entrance. Garrett Biblical Institute, affiliated with Northwestern University, has the largest number of students with more than three hundred; Perkins School of Theology, a part of Southern Methodist University, comes next with an enrolment of some 285. The Perkins School will move into a magnificent new quadrangle with seven buildings this autumn. Drew Theological Seminary in Madison, New Jersey, with Boston, the Divinity School of Duke University, and Candler School of Theology, a part of Emory University, are large, well-equipped and manned institutions. Iliff in Denver, Colorado, the School of Religion of the University of Southern California and Westminster Seminary in Maryland have smaller student bodies, but all are Grade A seminaries.

Besides the students preparing for the Methodist ministry in Methodist seminaries, some seven hundred are preparing in non-Methodist theological

seminaries. According to recent reports there were more than a hundred Methodist students in the Union Theological Seminary in New York and about an equal number at Yale Divinity School, while the Divinity School of the University of Chicago and Harvard Divinity School attract large numbers. Distinguished Methodist scholars are on the faculties of these inter-denominational seminaries, and a Methodist is now the Dean of the Yale Divinity School. Many of the denominational seminaries of other Churches have Methodist students. Cases in point are the two Congregational seminaries, Chicago Theological Seminary affiliated with the University of Chicago, and the Pacific School of Religion. Methodists make up a large proportion of their students, and both have Methodists on their faculties. One of the consequences of this inter-denominational training for the ministry is that Methodist students often enter the Congregational ministry, and not a few become Episcopal clergymen. The Lutherans, Southern Baptists, and Episcopalians do not participate in this inter-denominational theological training.

Inter-denominational periodicals have become increasingly influential, although most of the several denominations still maintain their official publications. *The Christian Advocate*, the great Methodist weekly, for instance, has a circulation of more than three hundred thousand; but such papers as *The Christian Century* exercise an influence far greater than any one denominational paper. Begun as a Disciple organ more than a generation ago, with an editorial staff made up of Disciples, it now has several Methodists on its staff, among them the Editor in Chief. The Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, the trade name of the Methodist Publishing House in America, publishes books by many non-Methodist authors, and also an inter-denominational journal, *Religion in Life*.

# V

The disappearance of all legal inequalities among the American Churches has been a basic factor in preparing the ground for closer Church relationships. Many intelligent Church people are surprised when told that in eight of the thirteen American colonies there were Church establishments. In all of the southern colonies and partially in New York, the Church of England was the establishment; in the three New England colonies, Congregationalism was the established body. As has already been indicated, neither of these colonial established bodies ever became popular Churches, partly because they were never able to get over the superiority feeling that came as a result of once having been special privileged bodies. Nothing can be more fatal to a Christian Church than to nourish superiority complexes. The complete equality of all religious bodies in the eyes of the law of the land has become among American Protestants as a whole a proud tradition. Where one Church has privileges in the State not shared by all the Churches there is small possibility of an unrestrained cordiality developing.

Increasing historical-mindedness in American evangelical Protestantism is one of the results of a better educated ministry. Larger familiarity with historic Christianity has brought home to the Protestant ministry and people alike, the consciousness of the rich heritage to which all Christian bodies alike are heirs,

and they have begun to find a larger use for the ancient symbols, hymns, and liturgy. In other words, the American Protestant Churches are being drawn together by a larger appreciation of a great common heritage. They are more and more finding in the past a common standing-ground, and they have a growing appreciation of 'The Church' and a lessening emphasis upon 'the Churches'.

Methodism is historically ecumenical-minded. The fact that John Wesley held that there was no form of Church polity prescribed in Scripture has led Methodists to adopt differing forms of Church government. The additional fact that Methodism has never taken a rigid doctrinal position, as compared, for instance, with the Calvinistic bodies, has naturally led to a broad tolerance. John Wesley's oft-repeated statement that 'we can no more think alike than we can see or hear alike' well expresses the Methodist position. It was natural therefore that American Methodism should have had an active part in all inter-church and ecumenical movements such as the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, and in the World Council of Churches.

WILLIAM WARREN SWEET

---

## THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE SACRAMENT OF THE LORD'S SUPPER IN THE METHODIST CHURCH AFTER THE DEATH OF JOHN WESLEY

IN THE HISTORY of the Methodist Church the two sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper have always been honoured as of 'Divine appointment and perpetual obligation'. The administration of these sacraments has, however, varied considerably. Once the administration of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper had been granted to the societies in Wesleyan Methodism, the Conference permitted only its ministers to conduct the service and they had to follow a prescribed Order. In the other Methodist Churches the discipline was not so strict, the administration was not confined to the ministry, and when Orders of Service were eventually issued their use was not made compulsory.

We shall examine the administration of this Sacrament first in the Wesleyan Methodist Church, then in each of the divisions, and finally in the present Methodist Church.

### THE WESLEYAN METHODIST CHURCH

At the death of Wesley the administration of the Sacrament was one of the most difficult problems the Conference had to face. John Wesley had always urged his people to attend the celebrations in the Parish Church, and in many cases the large number of Methodists coming to the Sacrament had proved a source of serious embarrassment to the incumbent. Wesley himself, and other clergy of the Established Church in association with him, administered the Sacrament, but at his death many of the societies desired to receive the Sacrament from the hands of their own preachers. Other societies were strongly opposed to this and soon the Connexion was sharply divided on the issue. The

Itinerant Preachers were often involved in the disputes, and one of them, Alexander Kilham,<sup>1</sup> pressed his demands until the first break with the Conference took place and a 'New Itinerancy' was formed.

In 1791 the Conference, by pledging itself to follow Wesley's plan, hoped to allay these disputes. Unhappily this decision could be interpreted in two ways. The 'Church Methodists' regarded it as binding Methodism to the Church and therefore forbidding the general celebration of the Sacrament. Others held that it meant following up the openings of Providence, and they urged the Conference to allow the general administration of the Sacrament. The following Conference (1792) was so divided that it was driven to decide the question by drawing lots. It was by the chance drawing of a paper that the administration of the Sacrament in the ensuing year was forbidden except in London. This was merely a practical expedient and the main problem remained unsolved: indeed, it became more pressing than ever.

The next Conference (1793) very reluctantly gave permission to some of the societies to administer the Sacrament 'where the whole society is unanimous for it and will not be contented without it',<sup>2</sup> but the Sacrament was to be administered only in the evening and according to the form of the Church of England. A list of forty-eight Circuits was given in the *Minutes of the Conference* for 1794 where the Sacrament could be administered, but it was agreed that 'the Lord's Supper shall not be administered in future where the union and concord of the society can be preserved without it'.<sup>3</sup>

The question was eventually settled when the Conference of 1795 adopted the Plan of Pacification<sup>4</sup>—one of the most decisive documents of the Church. It threw the responsibility on the societies themselves. Wherever the majority of the Trustees and the majority of the Stewards and Leaders, acting separately, 'allow of it', the Sacrament could be administered provided the consent of the Conference had been obtained. In cases where there was a society but no chapel the Sacrament could still be administered 'if the majority of the Stewards and Leaders testified that it was the will of the people'. The consent of the Conference was still, of course, necessary before the service could be held.

The Plan was generally accepted as a wise solution of the problem. The unrest, however, did not entirely subside and it was admitted after a year's trial that there were still 'some complaints on both sides'. The Superintendents were directed to ensure that the people had what they desired. The preachers were not to exercise any influence in the matter—they were to 'leave the people everywhere entirely free'.<sup>5</sup> Although isolated cases remained for many years (the Sacrament was not administered at City Road, for example, until 1826)<sup>6</sup>, it soon became the custom for the Itinerant Preachers to administer the Sacrament throughout the whole of Wesleyan Methodism and the break with the Established Church was complete.

### *The Celebrant*

It was laid down in the Plan that 'the Lord's Supper shall be administered by those only who are authorized by the Conference' and it was arranged that

<sup>1</sup> Before the death of John Wesley he had petitioned the Conference to 'let us have the liberty of Englishmen and to give the Lord's Supper to our societies'. See Stevens's *History of Methodism*, III.15.

<sup>2</sup> *Minutes of Conference* (1793), 279.

<sup>3</sup> *ibid.* (1794), 299.

<sup>4</sup> *ibid.* (1795), 322-3.

<sup>5</sup> *ibid.* (1796), 348.

<sup>6</sup> See *Wesley's Chapel* (Telford), 46.

suitable Superintendents should be stationed in those Circuits where the Sacrament had been requested. In 1811 when the Conference issued various directions to the Superintendents it was made very clear that only a Travelling Preacher in full connexion could administer the Sacraments.<sup>7</sup> This rule remained strictly in force until nearly the end of the century. Even though from 1829 the Junior Preachers were allowed under certain conditions to administer the Sacrament of Baptism, none but the Travelling Preachers were allowed to administer the Lord's Supper.

Toward the end of the century, however, it was felt that in some special cases a Probationer ought to have authority to administer both the Sacraments even though he was not yet ordained to that office. In 1892<sup>8</sup> it was laid down that an application could be made to the President through the Chairman of the District for a Probationer to receive a Dispensation to administer the Sacraments in Circuits where the need was pressing. Ten years later the Stationing Committee was instructed to prepare a list of such appointments so that the Probationers so stationed should receive the Dispensations.<sup>9</sup>

### *The Service*

At the outset the Conference insisted that the Sacrament should not be administered in opposition to the Established Church. Normally the service was held 'on Sunday evenings only', but if the Leaders wished, the service could take place in 'Church hours', but in any case it was never to be held 'on those Sundays in which it is administered in the Parochial Church'.<sup>10</sup> These regulations remained for a short time, but with the increasing separation from the Church of England they soon lapsed. A transition stage is revealed in the instructions of 1806. While on the one hand it was recognized that the members might receive the Sacrament elsewhere than in a Methodist Chapel, yet on the other hand, it was insisted that the Sacrament should be frequently administered wherever it was appointed:

We once more earnestly beseech all the members of our Societies, conscientiously to attend this sacred ordinance of God our Saviour at every opportunity; and do entreat them to approach the Lord's Table, at least, once in every month, either in our own chapels or elsewhere; and to make a point of staying till the whole service be concluded. . . . And, in order to remove every excuse, let this blessed sacrament be *regularly and frequently* administered wherever it has been appointed by the Conference.<sup>11</sup>

In many Circuits it became increasingly difficult for the Superintendent to arrange for this frequent administration of the Sacrament. After urging in 1896 that the Sacrament should be administered more often on weekdays where a Sunday administration was impossible,<sup>12</sup> the Conference four years later laid down its final rules. The Lord's Supper 'should be administered once a month in all our principal churches' and a morning communion should be arranged 'especially in connexion with our larger congregations'. Other societies were not so well cared for in this matter, but the Conference was able to rule that the service should be held 'at least once a quarter, either some time on the

<sup>7</sup> *Minutes of Conference* (1811), 223.

<sup>8</sup> *ibid.* (1892), 219.

<sup>9</sup> *ibid.* (1902), 359.

<sup>10</sup> *ibid.* (1795), 323.

<sup>11</sup> *ibid.* (1806), 348.

<sup>12</sup> *ibid.* (1896), 230.



Lord's Day, or where that is not possible, at some time during the week when the minister visits the place'.<sup>13</sup>

### *The Order of Service*

The Lord's Supper was administered according to the form of the Established Church, or the *Abridgement of the Liturgy* prepared by John Wesley, but in this Order the minister had liberty 'to give out hymns, and to use exhortation and extemporary prayer'.<sup>14</sup> Charles Wesley had written hymns for this service and the Conference expected the ministers to make full use of these hymns.<sup>15</sup> The rules were re-emphasized in 1840 and the Superintendents instructed to see that all the chapels had at least the *Abridgement* available for use.

In 1882 when the *Office* was revised, either the Anglican *Liturgy* or Mr. Wesley's *Abridgement* remained permitted alternatives. These forms were not extensively used, however, and it soon became the general custom for the societies to have the Conference *Order of Administration*. This familiar service of the Wesleyan Methodist Church followed the *Book of Common Prayer* closely. It omitted only the Collect for the Day and the Lord's Prayer, together with an alternative prayer after the celebration. In some places a few sentences of a set prayer were deleted. Otherwise the service was identical with that of the Church of England.

### *Membership and the Sacrament—the closed communion*

The Conference strictly controlled admission to the Sacrament. At first only the members were allowed to attend; later, others who wished could do so, but only by special permission of the minister. Until the time of Union official ruling condemned the open Table as a grave scandal to the Church and its Sacraments.

It was bluntly ruled in 1796, 'No person shall be suffered, on any pretence, to partake of the Lord's Supper among us, unless he be a member of our Society or receive a note of admission from the superintendent, which note must be renewed quarterly'.<sup>16</sup> The members themselves were expected to attend and to show their tickets regularly at this service. Often, however, the difficulty was not to prevent unauthorized persons from attending the service, but rather was it to ensure that the members were present. Sometimes the preachers were instructed to emphasize the importance of the service and even to question the members on their attendance, and if need be, address 'suitable exhortation or admonition' to those found negligent.<sup>17</sup> The situation was not an easy one, for many Methodists had been brought up knowing little about the Sacrament and it was a long time before the societies came to value it as they ought. A revealing passage in the Address to the Societies from the Conference of 1837 indicates these difficulties:

Some of the means of grace are prudential; but the Lord's Supper being instituted by our redeeming Saviour Himself, to be observed by His disciples until His appearing again, becomes binding on the consciences of all His followers. . . . It is greatly to be regretted that this service is neglected by many of the members of our societies; and it is to be feared is not observed with due solemnity by others. The practice of

<sup>13</sup> *Minutes of Conference* (1900), 229.

<sup>16</sup> *ibid.* (1796), 348.

<sup>14</sup> *ibid.* (1795), 323.

<sup>17</sup> *ibid.* (1806), 348; (1829), 513.

<sup>15</sup> *ibid.* (1825), 56.

communicants retiring from the chapels in a disorderly manner, one after another, as soon as they have received the sacred elements, and leaving the officiating Minister to conclude the service almost alone, marks either a thoughtless or an irreverent state of mind. This evil, as well as that of neglect, ought to be diligently and universally avoided. Surely when the service is to commemorate the sacrifice of our dying Lord, to feast the soul on His death, and to proclaim our affection toward Him before His Church, and in obedience to His command, we ought to be prepared to attend gladly and profitably on such an ordinance. We earnestly recommend to you diligence in this duty.<sup>18</sup>

Those who were not members could attend the Sacrament provided they had a note from the Superintendent or, in later years, from the minister conducting the service.<sup>19</sup> The final statement on the whole question was made in 1889. Strangers who occasionally came to the ordinary service and who desired to remain to the Sacrament could do so provided they assured the minister 'of their fitness', and received a special note. The Conference stated explicitly: '*That the table of the Lord be open to all comers is surely a great discredit and a serious peril to any Church*'.<sup>20</sup> The spirit of this regulation, however, was often honoured rather than the letter, and at the time of Union it was common for a minister to invite 'all who love the Lord' to remain to the Sacrament.

#### THE METHODIST NEW CONNEXION

One of the reasons for the formation of the New Itinerancy (later the Methodist New Connexion) was to secure the proper celebration of the Sacrament. They claimed 'the right to regard their own preachers as fully qualified ministers and to receive the ordinances from their hands'.<sup>21</sup> It was to be expected, therefore, that the Sacrament would be especially valued and its administration regular and frequent. Almost the first statement of the Connexion was that 'members of the old Connexion will be admitted at our love-feasts and sacraments',<sup>22</sup> and when the list of doctrines was prepared the importance of the Sacraments was stressed: 'We hold and believe that the Ordinances of Baptism and the Lord's Supper are of Divine appointment and of perpetual obligation in the Church of Christ'.<sup>23</sup> The Connexion was always closest to the Wesleyan Methodists and retained with conviction 'the same holy and refreshing ordinances, the same heart-stirring means of grace . . . as existed in the early days of Methodism'.<sup>24</sup>

The Sacrament was administered once a month (on the first Lord's Day) in all the main chapels, and at least once a quarter in the country places. The ministers appointed to the Circuit were charged with the duty of administration, 'where practicable'.<sup>25</sup> Occasionally persons other than ministers officiated, but in any case, 'where it was judged necessary', the Leaders of a society assisted in the distribution of the bread and the wine.

<sup>18</sup> *ibid.* (1837), 233-4.

<sup>19</sup> *ibid.* (1869), 622. This led to a peculiar situation. If such a person attended the Sacrament regularly, he held a strange position in the Church. He was neither a member, nor yet only an adherent. He was a communicant, but the Conference never defined his position. In 1875 it was announced that owing to the 'very great diversity of opinion' the Conference was not prepared 'to proceed to any new legislation'.

<sup>20</sup> *Minutes of Conference* (1889), 412. Repeated in the *Summary* (1923), 40.

<sup>21</sup> *A Centenary of the Methodist New Connexion*, 183.

<sup>22</sup> *Minutes* (1797), 23.

<sup>23</sup> *Handbook for the Methodist New Connexion*, 41.

<sup>24</sup> Preface to the *General Rules* (1861), v.

<sup>25</sup> *General Rules* (1861), 48.

In common with the Wesleyan Methodist Church, all the members were expected to attend the Sacrament—'All our members shall be required regularly to attend upon this ordinance, both as a pledge of their attachment to their Redeemer, and as a condition of their communion with His people.'<sup>26</sup> Provision was made for 'serious persons' who were not members of the society to attend the Sacrament, and a special note of admission was issued for this purpose. The Conference never prescribed a set *Order of Service* for the administration of the Sacrament. The minister conducted the service in his own way, though if he desired he could make use of several unofficial *Orders* prepared for use in the Connexion.

#### THE UNITED METHODIST FREE CHURCH

The meeting of the delegates of the Wesleyan Association in 1836 laid down in its first rule that each of the societies was 'to be at liberty to have such particular rules as to Church Government and as to its ministry as it may think proper to adopt'.<sup>27</sup> When the Association joined with others to form the United Methodist Free Church it agreed as part of the basis of that Union that 'each church has the right to choose its own officers and provide for the regular observance of those ordinances of religion which are of divine appointment—such as preaching the Gospel, Baptism, and the Supper of the Lord'.<sup>28</sup>

Though the Sacrament was honoured in the Church, no regulations were laid down to govern its administration. This was left entirely in the hands of the local society. The Annual Assembly encouraged the members to attend the Sacrament, and suggested as a check on the attendance that every member should be issued with a sacramental ticket, 'to be given up at each sacramental service'.<sup>29</sup> But there was no strong connexional control and each society conducted its own affairs in its own way.

#### THE BIBLE CHRISTIANS

Soon after the Bible Christian Conference began to meet, the Sacraments were briefly considered. The Lord's Supper was emphasized as a 'precious memorial' of the Divine Saviour, and the members of the Connexion were expected to attend the service. In the Administration of the Sacrament the practice of the New Connexion was closely followed. It was the custom for the Itinerant Preachers to conduct the service, though this was by no means an absolute rule. Stewards or other selected persons assisted in the distribution of the elements to the congregation.

For many years there was no prepared *Order of Service* for the minister to follow, no set prayers, and no appointed lessons:

In celebrating this solemn memorial of the death of Christ, we commence with singing, reading, and prayer; the minister usually gives a short address respecting the nature of the ordinance, the benefits accruing from the Saviour's death, and their obligations to devote themselves to Him. He then presents the bread and the wine to each person present, occasionally offering a few suitable remarks. The offering is then taken and the service concluded with singing and prayer.<sup>30</sup>

<sup>26</sup> *General Rules* (1861), 48.

<sup>27</sup> *ibid.*, p. 16.

<sup>28</sup> *Minutes of the Annual Assembly* (1857), 25.

<sup>29</sup> *Free Methodist Manual*, 19.

<sup>30</sup> *Digest of Rules and Regulations* (1892), 55.

When a 'Form of celebration of the Lord's Supper' was eventually prepared it followed similar lines. The service began with suitable sentences, a hymn, and one or two set prayers (or alternatively, extempore prayer). Two passages were appointed to be read and then the minister could either read a prepared address or deliver his own. The familiar invitation of the Liturgy, 'Ye that do truly and earnestly repent . . .' led immediately to the distribution of the elements. The minister delivered the bread and the wine to those who were assisting him, and then while the congregation received the elements he recited passages of Scripture. Prayers, a hymn, and the benediction closed the service.

In the Bible Christian communion, too, the members did not appear to value the Sacrament as they should, nor was it celebrated frequently enough. The Conference of 1883 stated: 'We do not consider that sufficient attention is given to the Sacrament in many places by members of our churches, or that its observance is frequent enough in most of our Circuits'.<sup>31</sup> It directed that the Sacrament should be administered at least once a month in the towns (usually the first Sunday evening of the month) and once a quarter in our country societies. Strangers could be invited to remain to the service if they desired.

#### THE UNITED METHODIST CHURCH

The United Methodist Church was formed in 1907 from these three branches of Methodism and much that was common to them all was continued in the new Church. The Foundation Deed Poll affirmed that the Sacrament was 'of divine appointment and of perpetual obligation',<sup>32</sup> and laid down as one of the conditions of membership, 'attendance at the Lord's Supper'.<sup>33</sup> The service was usually held once a month in the town and once a quarter in the country societies. Normally, it was administered by the regular ministers of the church, but no regulation was made confining it to the ministry alone.

A few years after the union a *Book of Services* was published on the instructions of the Conference, and though the use of the book was never made compulsory the Sacrament was usually administered according to its direction. The 'Order for the observance of the Communion or Sacrament of the Lord's Supper' was in some ways similar to the former Bible Christian service. Sentences taken exclusively from the Psalms were read first, and then after a hymn and the Lord's Prayer there was a long prayer of Thanksgiving. As an alternative to this the minister 'or some other person', could offer 'an extempore Prayer of Thanksgiving'. Certain passages from the Gospels and the Epistles were read, but while provision was made for an address, this was to be given only 'on some special occasion', and ordinarily a hymn preceded the Words of Institution. A prayer of 'renewed consecration', the parting hymn, and the benediction closed the service.

The rubric made provision for others to assist the minister in the distribution of the elements. The Minister 'and any who may be assisting him first receive the bread and wine' and then they distribute to the congregation. Here again the congregation sometimes included those who were not members of the Church.

<sup>31</sup> *ibid.*

<sup>32</sup> Paragraph 3, section xi.

<sup>33</sup> Paragraph 7.

## THE PRIMITIVE METHODIST CHURCH

The Primitive Methodist Church began in the enthusiastic atmosphere of camp-meetings and love-feasts. Much more emphasis was placed upon preaching services than upon the Lord's Supper, and it was only slowly that the administration of the Sacrament came to have a place in the Connexion. The earliest reference to it is in 1821 when the question, 'To whom shall the Sacrament be administered?' was answered 'To all our societies which request it'.<sup>34</sup> There was no compulsion in the matter, and it was only when the societies became firmly established that the Sacrament was administered to them. It was laid down further that the Sacrament should be administered 'by such persons as the quarterly boards shall judge proper'.<sup>35</sup> By 1860 it was the normal practice throughout the Connexion to administer the Sacrament and in the *Consolidated Minutes* of that year it was assumed that the ordinance would be observed, but care was taken that the Sacrament should be administered only by those who were authorized. Normally the person authorized was the minister, but others (whether local preachers or not) could be 'appointed on the station plan' to administer the Sacrament.<sup>36</sup>

An *Order of Administration of Baptism and other Services* was issued early in the present century. This included near the end the Order for the Administration of the Lord's Supper. The service opened with a hymn, a set 'Prayer for the Church', and some selected passages of Scripture. Following these there came a shortened form of the address, 'Dearly beloved in the Lord', and the humble confession (but without the absolution), the comfortable words, the pre-communion prayer of institution and then the celebration itself. The service was concluded with a hymn, the set prayer of the liturgy, and the benediction. It is significant that the Primitive Methodist service was much more liturgical in form than that of the United Methodist Church.

## THE METHODIST CHURCH

It is evident, therefore, that at Union the practices of the Wesleyan Methodist Church on the one hand, and those of the United Methodist and Primitive Churches on the other hand, were quite different. In the parent Church only the ministers had authority to administer the Sacrament. Under special conditions of pressing need probationers could receive a dispensation from the President to perform this office. No other person in the Wesleyan Methodist Church had this authority, and no one else would ever presume to claim it. As might be expected in a communion that grew under the shadow of the Anglican Church, the service itself was fully liturgical, following closely the Order of the *Book of Common Prayer*. Further, the 'Table of the Lord' was always legally a closed table, and only the members, or those who were specially permitted by the minister, could receive the elements.

In the other branches, while the minister normally conducted the service, this was by no means the rule, and in any case he often had lay assistants who distributed the bread and the wine. Though *Orders of Service* were prepared, their use was never compulsory and far greater freedom was allowed in the conduct of the worship.

<sup>34</sup> *Minutes* (1821), 10.<sup>35</sup> *ibid.*<sup>36</sup> *Consolidated Minutes* (1860), 64.



The *Deed of Union* of the Methodist Church reflects these divergencies. It lays down that the 'general usage of the Churches or denominations whereby the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper is administered by Ministers shall continue to be observed'. The *Deed*, however, allowed for a transitional period during which the local Circuits of the three uniting Churches would become amalgamated. During this period the unamalgamated Circuits were allowed to continue the practice of the Church to which they originally belonged. When Circuits were amalgamated they adopted the general custom of the Church whereby only the ministers officiated at the service. Further, in view of former traditions, the *Deed* made provision for the authorization of persons other than ministers to administer the Sacrament. Where it could be shown that a Church was 'deprived of a reasonably frequent and regular administration through lack of ministers', the Circuit concerned could apply for this authorization from the Representative Session of the Conference.<sup>37</sup>

For some years after Union the situation remained confused. Local churches—even though in amalgamated Circuits—often continued their pre-Union practices. Fourteen years after Union the Conference made a resolute attempt to regularize the situation. It restated the principle that the Sacrament should be administered only by the ministers, but provision could be made for lay administration where this was needed. If a church within a Circuit was 'deprived of reasonably frequent and regular administration through lack of ministers', the Circuit concerned could apply for the authorization of 'persons other than ministers'.<sup>38</sup> This application was considered by the General Purposes Committee, the Synods, and then by the Conference. A person so authorized received 'instruction in the administration of the Sacraments by the Chairman of the District or a minister appointed by him; the forms of service in our *Book of Offices* being used as a basis of instruction'. He was publicly inducted into his office and his authorization lasted for three years.<sup>39</sup>

The Methodist Church continued the practice common to all the uniting Churches of administering the Sacrament monthly wherever possible, 'and under no circumstances less frequently than once a quarter'.<sup>40</sup> It was the 'privilege and duty' of the members to receive the Sacrament; others who desired to attend were welcomed at the Table of the Lord.

### *The Service*

There were two *Orders of Service* for the administration of the Lord's Supper or Holy Communion.<sup>41</sup> The first *Order* followed closely the *Order* of the Wesleyan Methodist Church with few alterations. The addition of the Collect for the Day, and the Lord's Prayer repeated immediately after the celebration made the service even more nearly identical with that of the *Book of Common Prayer*. As an alternative to the rehearsal of the Ten Commandments, however, the Commandments of Christ were given. The actual words of the administration, too, were modified from both the Wesleyan and the Anglican liturgy.

The second *Order* was shorter and much less liturgical in its form. While the first *Order*, with hymns and sermon was commended 'as the Order of Worship in our churches at such times as the Communion Service is held', the second

<sup>37</sup> *Deed of Union*, Para. 34.

<sup>38</sup> *Minutes of Conference* (1946), 203-4.

<sup>39</sup> *ibid.* (1947), 41-2.

<sup>40</sup> *ibid.* (1946), 203-4.

<sup>41</sup> *The Book of Offices* was issued by the Conference of 1936.

*Order* seemed to have been prepared for use at the close of the ordinary worship of the Church, particularly in those societies not so accustomed to the liturgical form. The service itself included certain of the ancient prayers of the Church—the Prayer of Thanksgiving, the prayer of Humble Access, and the Gloria—but it had a different version of the Confession (without the Absolution), and of the Comfortable Words. It is perhaps too early to say whether this particular *Order* has added greatly to the devotional life of the Church.

The main tradition, therefore, has been modified in the present Methodist Church in several ways. First, in addition to the ministers, laymen duly authorized by the Conference can administer the Sacrament. Secondly, an alternative *Order of Service* less liturgical in its form has been provided. Thirdly, an invitation is usually given to 'all who love the Lord' (whether actually members or not) to receive the Sacrament.

NORMAN W. MUMFORD

---

## *Notes and Discussions*

### REMARKS ON THE ORIGIN OF LIFE

IT MAY seem presumptuous, and almost an impertinence for one who is without scientific training, to attempt a discussion on the origin of life upon the earth. It might be said in reply, however, that scientists whose knowledge of theology is by no means profound, and who, to quote Dr. Forsyth, have never studied one of Paul's great epistles, do nevertheless intervene with dogmatic statements about the Christian religion.

But, what is more to the point, we are not to be warned off from all consideration of the outer ranges of a subject, because the more recondite phases are the secret of the scientist. There are aspects of this question which are common property, and which, with serious implications, fall within the orbit of ordinary intelligence. We may not know precisely what is taking place in the laboratory, or what hopes are cherished that the gap between the dead and the living will ultimately be bridged. We can wait without apprehension, until a disclosure is made that announces the triumph for which unceasing endeavours are made. Meanwhile, we are at liberty to take account of what has been proclaimed upon the housetops, and inquire what issues are involved.

We know, for example, that the theory of spontaneous generation, as it is called, is for ever cast as rubbish to the void. Indeed the path of science is strewn with the wreckage of abandoned beliefs. It is strange that, while theology is often discredited because of doctrines which have yielded to fuller light and further knowledge, science seems to know nothing of repentance, and offers no apology for former beliefs, which are now labelled as superstition, but at one time held a sacred place in the creed of the scientist. There is however nothing of which humanity needs be ashamed, in recalling the faltering steps, and impossible beliefs, of an earlier generation. Knowledge grows from more to more. The Spirit which guides into *all* truth, would cease to operate if all our creeds, beliefs, and theories were foreclosed. It is a large part of life's exhilaration to discover truths which either modify or correct what has hitherto been known.

It was seriously urged by Van Helmont, 'a deservedly famous physicist and chemist of the sixteenth century',<sup>1</sup> that mice could be spontaneously generated by placing some dirty linen in a receptacle together with a few grains of wheat, or a piece of cheese. This may appear to us to be an absurdity too crass for the mind of a schoolboy. But anyone who is familiar with the history of thought and inquiry, is always slow to brand beliefs, now found to be impossible, as absurd. The great men of the past did not know what we know; but our knowledge is the fruit of their labours. We are not necessarily taller, even though we see more than the man upon whose shoulders we are standing.

It was Pasteur who gave to the theory of spontaneous generation its quietus. We know now that as the result of his patient experiments and brilliant generalizations, he provided the basis upon which Lister proceeded to methods which changed the whole outlook of surgery, and thereby assuaged agonizing

<sup>1</sup> Benjamin Moore. *The Origin and Nature of Life*, p. 164.

pain, and saved millions of lives. Yet Pasteur was not always hailed as a benefactor by his contemporaries. Even the scientist is slow to accept discoveries, which demand a complete reorientation of belief. We know now that it is not by placing mice in a box with dirty linen and cheese, or stuffing hay into a bottle with dirty water, and corking it down, that life is produced. Once material of any kind is completely sterilized, and hermetically sealed, no trace of life ever emerges. The scientist had therefore now to turn elsewhere in his quest.

The explanation suggested, perhaps with no great seriousness, by Lord Kelvin in his address to the British Association at Edinburgh in 1871, has never taken root, and need not detain our attention. He adumbrated the possibility of meteoric stones, with life-bearing spores, floating in space. Some of these were fortunate enough to impinge upon our lifeless globe, and having found the hospitality of a world, temperate and attuned to life, fastened themselves upon their new resting-place, and began at once to multiply and develop. The earnest inquirer, even if he could accept such an explanation, would still find himself with a batch of problems compared with which the problems of theology are mere child's play. We could not be satisfied by tracing the amazing and multitudinous life of our world to another world. The mystery of that other world would still remain to baffle us and still more the greater mystery of the life which survives such an adventure. We cannot liquidate our overdraft in one bank, by placing it, if we are permitted to do so, on another. To say that life came from another world leaves us where we were: we have simply transferred the problem from our own world, to a world unknown and inaccessible. But, as has been said, the scientist is no longer looking for the origin of life to any external source. It is to material and conditions at home that attention is directed and confined.

We have already remarked that only the trained and skilful physicist can be familiar with the nature and possibilities of 'organic colloids which constitute living structures'. It is from the combination of certain of the ninety-two elements already existing, from which it is thought life must be derived. What those elements are, what conjunction of them is necessary, or under what conditions they may be supposed to function in the production of life, are questions which should not prevent us from offering what may be called a layman's observations.

Let us suppose then that somehow, and sometime, the miracle does happen, that the gap is bridged, that life has been found to emerge from the non-living—would everything then be simple? Would it then be no longer necessary to postulate a Creator? Would St. John's affirmation be relegated to the reaction of pleasing and devout meditations which soothe the soul, and leave the mind untouched? 'All things were made by Him, and without Him was not anything made that was made.'

The very first question a simple man would be likely to ask would be one which concerns the quality or nature of those elements, which have given birth to the wonder of life. I do not know what particular atom, molecule, or colloid, is subjected to the physicists' experiment, and for the purpose of my inquiry it is not necessary to know. It is, in any instance, something which lies to hand, something which is accessible, something which is amenable to experiment.

It may have derived potentialities from the energy of the sun; but since no conceivable form of life could exist in the sun's raging fires and incredible heat, the sun cannot be considered in any parental relationship to life. It is with what already exists within the limits of our globe, and within that alone, that experiment must be made.

Let us suppose then—and this is as far as we can go—that some day the transition from material which appears to be as dead as the dodo to definite living objects, is effected. Have we then made a discovery, in the presence of which all becomes simple? We should still want to explore the secret of those elements, which have become the handmaid to recognized life. It is still accepted as an axiom that, *ex nihilo nihil fit*—out of nothing, nothing comes.

If these elements are charged with the tremendous potentialities which result in life, it seems to me to follow that such potentialities have to be accounted for. It almost takes one's breath away to contemplate the microscopic bacteria—or whatever other quality is postulated—lying somewhere in regions invisible to man, and by a happy conjunction, evolving into such forms of life as are capable of the impressive journey from uni-cellular life to the majesty of man, and the mind of a Shakespeare. The hard fact that still has to be accounted for is the existence of these undeveloped qualities which, considered by themselves and altogether apart from the life which now begins to function, are as profound a mystery as the gorgeous wealth of life and beauty now covering the earth.

If we say that life is derived from the non-living, and thereby dismiss the postulate of a Creator, we are left with the unsuspected secrets of the non-living upon our hands. It is plain, surely, that if we refuse to regard life as the direct gift of God, we have to resort to beliefs which drive us to invest the material of which the world is made with insoluble problems and unimaginable mysteries. It was not entirely wide of the mark when Dr. Ballard gave to one of his volumes the title, *The Miracles of Unbelief*. To place the original home of life within the elements (which are subject to experiment, but so far refuse to yield their secret) is to bring speculation to the aid of a theory, and venture upon assumptions which are hardly scientific. We have still to wait and see; but if once the chasm which separate the living from the non-living is bridged, we shall be compelled at once to use that bridge, so that we may cross to the territory of the non-living, and begin at once to inquire if 'non-living' is a correct description.

Nor is that the only problem that awaits the solution of the scientist who rejects theism. We know that the desired miracle of producing the living from the dead, if wrought at all, can only be wrought by bringing to the process the devotion and skill of the finest intellect and best-trained minds of our day. The physicist comes to his task richly laden with knowledge and experience. He is aided by the patient and conscientious work of others who have gone before him. He has equipped himself by his own experiment; he also implements apparatus and resources which are the fruit of untiring invention. With such equipment he proceeds to relate elements which do not of themselves coalesce, and it is necessary for him to create suitable conditions of atmosphere, temperature; and environment. As we watch him at his work we feel almost as if we are in the presence of one who transcends the limitations of humanity.



Now over against all this we are invited to suppose that what man, so gifted and skilful, has succeeded in doing, blind forces at a remote time and in unknown conditions have somehow effected. On the one side we have intelligence of the highest order, on the other mere chance, or unseeing good fortune. If man, it is argued, should ultimately succeed in producing some simple form of life, then there is no difficulty in supposing that automatic and unintelligent forces have somehow and at some time achieved the same result. It is much the same as if because Milton wrote *Paradise Lost*, a windmill with paper, ink, and types, might do the same! And this reminds one that Professor T. H. Huxley seriously argued that two dozen monkeys, tapping at typewriters, would be certain, sooner or later, to produce one of Shakespeare's sonnets. It certainly requires a profound knowledge of mathematics, or the fortunes of chance, to envisage such a fantastic possibility. But speculation of this kind seems to be employed, to get rid of man's cherished belief in the divine origin of life, with its corollary of an All-wise and Almighty Creator.

If man should prove capable of creating conditions and producing effects which result in a rudimentary form of life, what reason, it is asked, can there be to doubt that forces operating without skill or intelligence should not do the same? To most of us it is amazing that those whose credulity is equal to such a theory find it intellectually too difficult to accept the sublime truths of the Incarnation and the Resurrection.

Our questions do not end with the first appearance of life. We know from the authentic records of the rocks that the earliest and simple forms of life became increasingly complex. There was a persistent ascent in the scale of life. At the one end you have the amoeba, and at the other, man. The pilgrimage of life, through all its stages, is the most impressive that can ever be contemplated. The old design-argument of Paley was ruthlessly cast aside when evolution took the field. The structure, say, of the eye, with its exquisite adaptations to light, was shown to be the result of age-long processes, which involved the striving inherent in all life.

But even if we can no longer be the disciples of Paley, does it follow that there is no trace of a purpose and design in the realm of life? A thousand years with the Lord are as a day, and all our thinking is coloured, or biased, by our inability or reluctance to accept what seem to us to be the intolerably slow processes of the Almighty. Nor is the ascent, of which we speak, always steady and without intermission. But when we envisage, as it is our privilege to do, the march from the simple to the complex, we cannot deny that there has been a progress which has all the evidence of a directing Power, as well as a mind which as far transcends the mind of man, even though a kinship is acknowledged, as the heavens are high above the earth.

To say that a design-argument, which was based upon an imperfect view of the world, is rejected, is not to say that there is not design on a larger and more impressive scale. There is then still no reason for not accepting, with its awe-inspiring implications, St. John's Great word: '*In Him was Life, and the Life was the light of men.*'

RICHARD PYKE

## THE CHESS-BOARD OF LIFE

IN PROSE AND POETRY

IT was Thomas Huxley who—in one of his luminous but now neglected essays—likened the world to a chess-board and compared the vicissitudes of life with the fluctuations of fortune in the game of chess. He wrote:

The life, the fortune, and the happiness of every one of us, and, more or less of those who are connected with us, do depend upon our knowing something of the rules of a game infinitely more difficult and complicated than chess. It is a game which has been played for untold ages, every man and woman of us being one of the two players in a game of his or her own. The chess-board is the world; the pieces are the phenomena of the universe; the rules of the game are what we call the laws of Nature! The player on the other side is hidden from us. We know that his play is always fair, just, and patient. But also we know, to our cost, that he never overlooks a mistake, or makes the smallest allowance for ignorance. To the man who plays well, the highest stakes are paid, with that sort of overflowing generosity with which the strong shows delight in strength. And one who plays ill is checkmated—without haste, but without remorse.<sup>1</sup>

Huxley's metaphor brilliantly illustrates the varied experiences through with each man and woman in this world passes, the many joys and sorrows, the ups and downs of life, the hopes and fears which alternate within each human heart. But many of us would regard as too one-sided his picture of the relentlessness with which the poor defeated man is crushed by a soulless, though just, universe. His particular theory of man's place in nature necessarily limits Huxley's conception of human life and restricts his view of the part man plays in the shaping of his own destiny; it is a theory which satisfies neither the scientist nor the 'man in the street'.

Long before Huxley's time the chess-board metaphor had been employed in the verse of Omar Khayyám, the fourteenth-century Persian poet whose *Rubā'iyāt* became popular in Edward FitzGerald's version of 1859. In face of life's unknown and incalculable factors man is but a phantom figure, impotent in the hand of Fate:

*For in and out, above, about, below,  
'Tis nothing but a Magic Shadow-show,  
Play'd in a Box whose Candle is the Sun,  
Round which we Phantom Figures come and go.  
'Tis all a Chequer-board of Nights and Days  
Where Destiny with Men for Pieces plays:  
Hither and thither moves, and mates, and slays,  
And one by one back in the Closet lays.<sup>2</sup>*

The writers and poets of all ages, indeed, have taken hold of 'Life', and by the use of a thousand similes and metaphors they present us with a wonderful

<sup>1</sup> *Lay Sermons*, 'A Liberal Education'.

<sup>2</sup> Stanzas 46 and 49.

mosaic word-picture of endless variety and interest. Philosophers, ancient and modern, have searched their own hearts in the endeavour to penetrate the mystery of life's meaning: novelists have exercised their imaginative powers to the full, and preachers have laid bare their inmost thoughts concerning it, while men of no faith at all have simply stood aghast before its complexity and confusion.

When we open our eyes it is easy to see that life is indeed almost exhaustless in its variety, whether or not it be true that 'Variety's the very spice of life'. The 'mixture' of life, according to W. J. Locke, is composed of 'a lot of rubbish, and a little truth'. William Hazlitt,<sup>3</sup> another essayist well worth reading, strikingly describes the strange assortment of experiences lumped together in that little word 'life':

I am not one of those splenetic persons who affect to think life of no value at all. 'What a little thing is human life,' is an exclamation in the mouths of moralists and philosophers to which I cannot agree. It is little, it is short, it is not worth having, if we take the last hour, and leave out all that has gone before—which has been one way of looking at the subject. . . . It is too mighty for us, and we say it is nothing! It is a speck in our fancy, and yet what canvas would be big enough to hold its striking groups, its endless subjects! It is light as vanity, and yet if all its weary moments, if all its head- and heart-aches were compressed into one, what fortitude would not be overwhelmed with the blow! What a huge heap, a 'huge, dumb heap', of wishes, thoughts, feelings, anxious cares, soothing hopes, loves, joys, friendships, Life is composed of!

Our national 'Bard of Avon' has numerous apt references to the subject. In *As You Like It* he, too, speaks of life as a play on the stage of the world, though he does not reduce it—in the manner of Omar Khayyám—to a shadow-show of 'phantoms':

*All the world's a stage,  
And all the men and women merely players:  
They have their exits and their entrances;  
And one man in his time plays many parts,  
His acts being seven ages.\**

True enough, there is sometimes plenty of comedy and farce about life's performance—it appears to play the most fantastic tricks upon its victims; but again, grim tragedy is not for long excluded from its programme.

Most people are aware that life is an arena where colossal issues have to be settled, a battleground where mighty forces are in opposition. Whether it be interpreted as a play, a dream, a journey, a race, or a contest—or anything else—there is one element essential to victory, the element of purpose. Every life must have some aim, high or low, noble or base, distant or near; and the nature of this aim will largely determine the quality of the life. It may be for ease, wealth, fame, happiness, or contentment, that a man strives; or it may be for the success of some institution or organization of social importance; or again, for the fulfilment of some disruptive or subversive ambition. Ample illustrations might be gathered from every field of literature.

<sup>3</sup> 1778-1830.

<sup>4</sup> Act ii, Scene 7.

Montaigne splendidly emphasizes the pre-eminence of purpose in human life, when he writes:

The great and glorious masterpiece of man is to know how to live to purpose; all other things, to reign, to lay up treasure, to build, are at most the little appendices and props.

But when he names pleasure as the most powerful motive and the first purpose in our daily conduct, his assertion is neither satisfying nor convincing:

Let philosophers say what they will, the main thing at which we all aim, even in virtue itself, is pleasure.

The almost universal prevalence of pleasure or happiness as a motive for human conduct cannot be questioned; but it may be doubted whether true happiness can be found by those who consciously and deliberately pursue it, to the exclusion or subversion of all other aims. Perhaps that is why Robert Louis Stevenson tells us:

In his own life, then, a man is not to expect happiness, only to profit by it gladly when it shall arise; he is on duty here; he knows not how or why, and does not need to know; he knows not for what hire, and must not ask.<sup>6</sup>

And so we might continue according to our fancy, adding piece after piece to the mosaic of 'Life' in the literature of the world: enough has been given to substantiate the claim that this intriguing subject has directly inspired some of our choicest prose and our finest poetry. My last quotation takes us back to Huxley's metaphor of the chess-board. But its author flatly contradicts the depressing theory that men and women are remorselessly shuffled as blind and mute pieces on a board, and claims that we each have a real measure of responsibility and a wide range of choice in what we make of this little thing called 'life'. People who live neither in the sombre gloom of Fatalism nor in the twilight of Determinism, but in the Faith of a Christian, will assuredly agree with him:

*A chequer-board of mingled light and shade?  
And we the pieces on it deftly laid?  
Moved and removed, without a word to say,  
By the same hand that board and pieces made?  
No pieces we in any fateful game,  
Nor free to shift on Destiny the blame;  
Each soul doth tend its own immortal flame,  
Fans it to Heaven, or smothers it in shame.<sup>6</sup>*

BENJAMIN RICHARDS

<sup>6</sup> Christmas Sermon.

<sup>6</sup> *Life's Chequer-board*, John Oxenham.

## POETRY AS A HUMAN DOCUMENT

IN ELIZABETHAN times, English poets, especially in their sonnets, not infrequently worked themselves into a frenzy of adoration toward some imaginary or idealized lady. But their avowal of affection was not always convincing. Thus Sylvester's ardour over-reaches itself:

*Were you the earth, dear love, and I the skies,  
My love should shine on you like to the sun,  
And look upon you with ten thousand eyes  
Till heaven waxed blind and till the earth were done.*

Another Elizabethan poet, Sir Philip Sidney, devotes a sonnet to this question:

*When nature made her chief work, Stella's eyes,  
In colour black, why wrapped she beams so bright?*

concluding with the conceit that Nature had darkened Stella's eyes with 'this mourning weed',

*To honour all their deaths who for her bleed.*

Though he belonged to the Elizabethan age, Shakespeare soon learned to shun its excesses. The story is told of a famous artist who one day took the whim of painting on the floor of his studio, near the door, a sketch of a pen. His representation was so realistic, that many who afterwards entered his studio, involuntarily stooped down to pick up what they thought was a pen lying on the floor. Shakespeare's 71st *Sonnet* is an idealized expression of love for a man or a woman. (Let the critics decide which.) As you read the following lines, you will readily acknowledge that, like the artist in the story just related, Shakespeare knew how to give to his picture the semblance of reality:

*No longer mourn for me when I am dead  
Than you shall hear the surly sullen bell  
Give warning to the world that I am fled  
From this vile world, with vilest worms to dwell:  
Nay, if you read this line, remember not  
The hand that writ it; for I love you so,  
That I in your sweet thoughts would be forgot,  
If thinking on me then should make you woe.*

All great poets know the secret of making the imaginary appear real.

There is yet another type of poem, born of experience, in which the pulse of reality throbs unmistakably. Cowper was fortunate in his friendship with Mrs. Mary Unwin, who cared for him in his periods of mental instability. In a poem addressed to his benefactress, Cowper voices his anguish at her breakdown in health:

*The twentieth year is well-nigh past  
Since first our sky was overcast;  
Ah! would that this might be the last!  
My Mary!*



*Thy spirits have a fainter flow,  
I see thee daily weaker grow—  
'Twas my distress that brought thee low,  
My Mary!*

The qualities of truth and sincerity can always be recognized when poets draw aside the curtain from their own affections. Elizabeth Barrett Browning pours out her very soul in a famous sonnet that describes her devotion to her betrothed Robert:

*How do I love thee? Let me recount the ways,  
I love thee to the depth and breadth and height  
My soul can reach. . . .*

Was ever birthday gift so genuinely and so charmingly inscribed as Tennyson's to his aged wife in the poem, *June Bracken and Heather*:

*I thought to myself I would offer this book to you,  
This and my love together,  
To you that are seventy-seven,  
With a faith as clear as the heights of the June-blue heaven,  
And a fancy as summer-new  
As the green of the bracken amid the gloom of the heather.*

These poems by Cowper, E. B. Browning, and Tennyson are not the extravagant effusions of an assumed affection; neither are they the fruits of a fertile imagination; they are the poetic record of actual experience—human documents in verse.

If Milton's longer works, such as *Paradise Lost*, reveal his capacity for constructive imagination, his shorter poems attest his humanity. In 1652, at the age of 44, as the result of a too liberal burning of midnight oil, Milton, while yet in the prime of life and in the full tide of his creative energy, was stricken with total blindness. But you will search in vain through his later poems for a single word of petulance or complaint. On the contrary, you will find ample evidence of his serenity of mind and heart. With undiminished confidence, he declares:

*They also serve who only stand and wait.*

The same spirit of noble contentment is expressed in Milton's second sonnet to Cyriack Skinner:

*Yet I argue not  
Against Heav'n's hand or will, nor bate a jot  
Of heart or hope; but still bear up and steer  
Right onward.*

It requires strong faith, as well as poetic skill, to pen such lines in the dark shadow of affliction.

Indeed, how much do some poems gain when they are put into their context of experience! For example, the misfortune that befell the seventeenth-century poet, Richard Lovelace, could neither quench his Muse nor damp his ardour.

As a result of his fearless presentation of the Kentish petition to the House of Commons, requesting the restoration of Charles the First's royal prerogatives, Lovelace was summarily thrown into prison, where, in 1642, he wrote these stirring lines:

*Stone walls do not a prison make,  
Nor iron bars a cage;  
Minds innocent and quiet take  
That for an hermitage;  
If I have freedom in my love,  
And in my soul am free,  
Angels alone, that soar above,  
Enjoy such liberty.*

The triumph of the spirit may also be seen in two poems whose authors faced, with dauntless heroism, the prospect of premature death. Emily Brontë's two sisters had died in 1825. Yet soon after the death of her brother Branwell in 1848, knowing as she must have done the imminence of her own departure in the same year, she wrote this valiant farewell message to a world of suffering and pain:

*No coward soul is mine,  
No trembler in the world's storm-troubled sphere:  
I see Heaven's glories shine,  
And faith shines equal, arming me from fear.*

That gallant soldier and promising poet, Wilfred Owen, M.C., whose death in action in November 1918 was an irreparable loss to English poetry, knew full well the perils and hardships of trench warfare. Nevertheless, the opening lines of his 'Apologia Pro Poemate' prove his unabated faith:

*I, too, saw God through mud—  
The mud that cracked when wretches smiled.  
War brought more glory to their eyes than blood,  
And gave their laughs more glee than shakes a child.*

Such poems move us by their sincerity as well as by their eloquence.

Thus far, examples have been given of the poet's version of his experience of love, friendship, misfortune, the menace of death, and war. Oscar Wilde's *E tenebris* arises out of his experience of sin:

*The wine of life is spilt upon the sand,  
My heart is as some famine-murdered land  
Whence all good things have perished utterly,  
And well I know my soul in Hell must lie  
If I this night before God's throne should stand.*

These lines may be sensational in their effect, but they are also supremely tragic as a self-judgement on a ship-wrecked life. How different is the sentiment of John Masfield at the thought of the Great Beyond. For him, the entrance upon eternity is an adventure:

*Death opens unknown doors. It is most grand to die.*

A consideration of the element of autobiography in English poetry must inevitably include in its scope Wordsworth's *Prelude*, which richly deserves to be called (with apologies to Robert Bridges) the 'Testament of Experience', Wordsworth's excursions into the realms of philosophy and politics produce many dreary pages in *The Prelude*, but when he stands upon the rock of experience, he is unassailable. For instance, an important crisis in Wordsworth's career is described in *The Prelude* (Book XI, *et seq.*) His strong sympathies with the revolutionary party in France were alienated by the excesses of the Reign of Terror. His high hopes for the future happiness of France were dashed to the ground. There is stark reality in his despondency:

*I lost  
All feeling of conviction, and, in fine,  
Sick, wearied out with contrarieties,  
Yielded up moral questions in despair.  
This was the crisis of that strong disease,  
This the soul's last and lowest ebb.*

After much mental anguish, he is able at last, largely through the healing influence of his sister Dorothy, to affirm:

*I sought  
For present good in life's familiar face,  
And built thereon my hopes of good to come.*

The later books of Wordsworth's *Prelude* make up, indeed, a human document of this journey from darkness to light, from despair to hope, from doubt to certainty.

Another spiritual pilgrimage can be traced in the hymns of Charles Wesley. The darkness of Wordsworth's soul was caused by the unreasoning brutality of rabid revolutionaries in France; Charles Wesley's by his own vain efforts to achieve perfect holiness. In describing his evangelical conversion, he wrote:

*Sudden expired the legal strife—*

an allusion to what elsewhere he calls 'ten legal years' (1728-38). During that period he never relaxed the rigorous discipline of the Holy Club at Oxford which he had founded—daily prayer and Bible reading, frequent Sacramental observance.

The sincerity of his diligent quest is well expressed in a pre-conversion hymn:

*Long have I vainly hoped and strove  
To force my hardness into love,  
To give Thee all Thy laws require,  
And labour's in the purging fire.*

But his conversion on 21st May 1738 brought the light and truth he had sought so long and painfully.

That vivid experience is recorded in one of his noblest hymns:

*Long my imprisoned spirit lay  
Fast bound in sin and nature's night;  
Thine eye diffused a quickening ray—  
I woke, the dungeon flamed with light;  
My chains fell off, my heart was free,  
I rose, went forth, and followed Thee.*

Thenceforward, in the thousands of hymns Charles Wesley gave to the world, the careful reader can discern a lively assurance, a quickened understanding, an exultant joy and a sweet peace—clear proofs of the reality of his conversion.

In another familiar hymn, the minstrel of Methodism raises the problem:

*How can a sinner know  
His sins on earth forgiven?*

His answer is firmly based on his own experience of divine pardon:

*What we have felt and seen  
With confidence we tell,  
And publish to the sons of men  
The signs infallible.*

THOMAS H. CARTER

## KINGSWOOD REFORMATORY SCHOOL, 1852-1871

THE OLD premises at Kingswood, near Bristol, which were vacated when Kingswood School moved to Bath, became the scene of an experiment which has had far-reaching consequences both within and without the Methodist Church. It was in the year 1852 that Miss Mary Carpenter conceived the idea of providing an alternative to imprisonment for young delinquents and was looking round for a suitable building. The Wesleyan School at Kingswood, with twelve acres of land and accommodation for a hundred children, seemed to fulfil the requirements. With the blessing of Lord Shaftesbury and of several prominent Churchmen, and with financial support from Mr. Russell Scott of Bath and Lady Byron, the premises were taken over.

It was a golden autumn evening when a cart drove slowly over to Kingswood. It carried the last load of bedding, on the top of which there rode triumphantly the first inmate of the Kingswood Reformatory School. A master and mistress had been engaged, and soon a little colony of sixteen boys and thirteen girls was playing a vital part in the redemption of young law-breakers. Miss Carpenter, who had charge of a Ragged School in Bristol at the same time, often travelled the four miles to Kingswood on foot in winter's cold or summer's heat to supervise the experiment.

The spirit which prompted the Kingswood venture was part of the legacy which the Wesleys had bequeathed to the nineteenth century. As a result of the Methodist Revival a new interest was being taken in offenders. The doctrine of Divine Mercy, which found so prominent a place in the preaching

and in the hymns of John and Charles Wesley, was being applied to the criminal. The idea of reforming the law-breaker was competing with the retributive and deterrent elements in penal administration. It was therefore most fitting that the premises of a Wesleyan School should provide the scene of one of the most important experiments in the application of reformative technique.

Though not a Methodist, but a Unitarian, Mary Carpenter had imbibed the spirit of 'the holy Wesley', as she reverently calls him. She brought to her work a deep faith in the power of God to change the human heart. Like John Wesley she combined the gift of spiritual insight with the ability to organize. She had the soul of a mystic, and at the same time the genius for administration. She believed that an experience of the grace of God could alone effect transformation of character. 'I do not believe in any reformation without religion,' she wrote on one occasion. 'I am sure that, unless the soul can be brought to prostrate itself humbly before the Eternal One, and, when humble and penitent, to commune with the Father of Spirits, there can be no peace.'

Those personal qualities which mark the devout and sincere Christian were evidenced by this brave woman in her pioneer movement. She was greatly influenced by the words of Jesus: 'For their sakes I sanctify Myself.' She maintained that 'the sanctified life, manifesting itself in daily actions, has a greater force than any intentional efforts'. Her strength was derived from a consciousness of being an agent in a sacred cause. Her deep religious faith enabled her to persevere in her mission despite disappointment and defeat. She wrote: 'I used often to wish for penances like the Catholics, feeling as if it would be the greatest pleasure to bear them; so I take all these (troubles and disappointments) as my spiritual penances, feeling only too happy to be able to bear them for the sake of the cause to which my heart is devoted.' She believed very strongly in the possibility of reformation; but insisted that the schools, which were to replace the prisons for young delinquents, should be established under the guidance of enlightened *Christian* benevolence.

In a letter to the Rev. John Clay, Miss Carpenter stresses the religious aspect of the Kingswood experiment. Because God is long-suffering and merciful and sends blessings on the evil as well as the good, there should be no vindictive element on the State's treatment of offenders. Revelation teaches that God receives the penitent with fatherly compassion; therefore 'the young criminals placed in the school must be treated as moral patients, for whose cure we should, as Christians, apply the best remedies in the wisest way'.

Miss Carpenter gave much time to a detailed study of delinquency in its various aspects. Instead of reading the lives of the saints she turned to the biographies of criminals. She examined police records and prison reports. She armed herself with facts and figures so as to defend her principles and win support from the general public. Her literary output began with *Reformatory Schools for the Children of the Perishing and Dangerous Classes and for Juvenile Offenders*, which was published in 1851. In 1853 there appeared *Juvenile Delinquents, their Condition and Treatment*; and in 1864 *Our Convicts*. She visited America and India in the interests of penal reform. (In Madras she saw a boy of ten who was a life convict and in irons.)



The burden of her message was that reformation comes from within. 'The will of the individual should be brought into such a condition as to wish to reform, and to exert itself to that end in co-operation with the persons who are set over him.' Brutal penalties did not change the heart. In her Ragged School in Bristol she had noticed that repeated convictions and imprisonments failed to effect any reformation in the young thieves. No force and no mechanical appliance could eradicate the rebellious impulse. Love alone could redeem. 'When the divine spirit within has been crushed and stifled from infancy, then the action of a strong and loving spirit can alone touch the inner springs of thought and action.' And again: 'The child must be placed where he will be gradually restored to the true position of childhood. He must have his affections called forth by the obvious personal interest felt in his own individual well-being by those around him; he must, in short, be placed in a family.'

These, then, were the principles that were applied to the children who were admitted to Kingswood Reformatory School. With a woman's insight into the child mind, Mary Carpenter saw the need for tenderness as an ingredient of the soul's medicine. On one of her visits to Kingswood during the first month of the institution's existence, she found 'a poor little sinner' who had had to be locked up. When he was brought out to see her he put his hand on her shoulder and sobbed out his grievances. The balm of a few kisses quite restored him to a sane state.

At first the school was conducted on a voluntary basis, the children being sent there by parents rather than by magistrates. As there was no legal sanction the problem created by absconders was acute. On one occasion six girls ran away and soon found themselves locked up in the police station. Miss Carpenter was sent for late that night and saw them caged like wild beasts. Referring to the experience she said: 'Had I felt any doubt before of the useless and injurious effect of physical coercion, and the force of kindness and moral influence on these poor children, all doubt would have vanished.' She went round the cells speaking in friendly fashion to each one in turn. Their hearts were soon softened and they were quite ready to go back to the school.

Thus it came to pass that Kingswood became the focal point of the new movement in penal administration. Magistrates, gaol chaplains and members of parliament took up the challenge. Miss Carpenter figured in newspaper headlines. The time was ripe for the adoption of a new technique, and Kingswood could not be ignored. A House of Commons Committee invited Mary Carpenter to give evidence. Fearlessly she proclaimed her conviction that imprisonment could not reform, and that the child's will must be enlisted in the work of reformation. 'There should be that degree of confidence shown to the children which will make them feel that they are workers together with the teachers.'

Was the Kingswood experiment successful? The evidence available seems to leave no doubt about the answer. A letter written by Mary Carpenter's mother in 1853 speaks of the high moral tone of the establishment and states that it is long since it has been thought necessary to have recourse to punishment. The chaplain of Liverpool gaol was delighted with what he saw at

Kingswood. He could hardly believe that the children with fine open countenance and affectionate hearts who so warmly greeted him were the depraved and hardened little wretches whom he had sent there. To Lady Byron, Miss Carpenter wrote: 'You will be pleased to hear that our Kingswood boys are improving delightfully; indeed a greater change has come over them in the last two months than I should have thought possible.' The boys were often sent on errands to Bristol. Girls who had been notorious thieves could now be trusted in the village with money. No one desired now to run away.

The Lynch family had occasion to be grateful to Kingswood. There were two brothers and two sisters, all accomplished in crime, who had been rescued from a drunken mother in Liverpool. Margaret, at the age of sixteen, arrived at the school after serving five terms of imprisonment. Picking pockets had become so habitual with her that once when she absconded she picked at least six pockets before being brought back. Margaret came to love Miss Carpenter as a mother. Michael was only thirteen years of age when he was condemned to ten years transportation. Margaret went to the ship to see him off to America. Brother and sister were now eager to stimulate each other to good as previously they were to evil. Then there was Tommy, the youngest. Such a wonderful change had taken place in his life that 'new birth' was not too strong a phrase to describe it. 'The poor boy feels that he has been bought with a price—a most unwearied labour of love.'

One of the ex-Kingswood boys became a fine young sailor. He had been a great 'plague' when at School, having run away nine times. 'He evidently feels that he was bought with a price, and looks as gratefully at me as you could wish. He seems quite to love Kingswood and old times. I showed him an old school photograph which I have kept in my Kingswood relic box; he was much pleased, and went off to get me one stylishly got up of his present self. To look on this picture and on that, in expression and bearing, would convert the sceptical.'

The honour in which the name of Mary Carpenter is held is evidence of the success of her venture. She was, as the monument in Bristol Cathedral testifies, 'foremost among the founders of Reformatory and Industrial Schools in this city and realm. Neither the claims of private duty nor the tastes of a cultured mind could withdraw her compassionate eye from the uncared for children of the streets. Loving them while yet unlovely, she so formed them to the fair and good as to inspire others with her faith and hope, and thus led the way to a national system of moral rescue and preventive discipline.' As in the realm of general education, so in the realm of this specialized training, Kingswood takes its place in history.

John Wesley had a study at Kingswood School. What transpired within those sacred walls during his lifetime may never be known. Nor will the full story ever be told of what that study meant to Mary Carpenter when, after a weary trudge from Bristol, she used it as a resting-place. 'There in many an hour of anxious thought by day or night she realized the force of the words which Wesley had written on the window-pane—"GOD IS HERE".'

J. ARTHUR HOYLES

## Recent Literature

*The Origin and Evolution of the Christian Church*, by T. G. Jalland. (Hutchinson's University Library, 7s. 6d.)

A sign of the revived emphasis upon Semitic elements in our Christian heritage is the fact that this book of Church History begins with a discussion of the Old Testament Canon, continues with Jewish Apocalyptic literature, and so on to the synagogue and its worship, and to Jewish initiation ceremonies. It is from such a background that Dr. Jalland shows us the emergence of Christian institutions, with the presbyterate 'the exact counterpart of the *zqenim* of Judaism' (p. 85). The coming of the *episkopos* is one of the most important subjects in the book, but, perhaps appropriately, not the clearest. Few would quarrel with the dating of the establishment of full mon-episcopacy, but does not the writer make too much of one interpretation of *ellogismos* in 1 Clement 44? The book throughout acknowledges its debt to *The Apostolic Ministry*, edited by the Bishop of Oxford. It is inconvenient that so many Hebrew and Greek words should not only be transliterated but placed at the end of the book in type almost too small to read. Dr. Jolland's is scholarly work, but he himself would not claim that it deals with the whole of what is indicated by the title. Treating institutions apart from the men who made them may be necessary, but it is less thrilling to dissect a corpse than to take a journey into the living past. JOHN FOSTER

*Five Centuries of Religion*, by G. G. Coulton. Volume 4, 'The Last Days of Medieval Monachism'. (Cambridge University Press, 45s.)

*Finis coronat opus!* Dr. Coulton did not live to see this last volume of his latest work through the press, for he passed away in 1947, but here he has bequeathed to the learned world a large mass of material on medieval Church history. His writings have not only provided the English student with a quite unique *corpus* of authorities for this period, but have brought to life the Middle Ages as they really were. Here in this last volume are all Coulton's familiar characteristics—great learning, a delightful style, chapter and verse for every statement, and a scholar's zest of battle against all romantic and tendentious perversers of history, particularly if they are English Roman Catholics! Coulton never could resist a fight and his consequent capacity for being sidetracked was illimitable. This last volume proves conclusively that the later state of the monasteries had excited the concern and indeed the wrath of bishops, kings, and lay people alike. It makes it clear, too, that many of the Popes were themselves profiting by the abuses. Then there was the wide impunity with which wrongdoers of all sorts escaped punishment. Nunneries were in the same boat as the monasteries and Coulton quotes some lively pages from Johann Busch describing how in 1455 the doughty sisters of Wennigsen frustrated the attempts of both the Bishop and the Duke of Brunswick to reform them. Clearly, as the Emperor said in 1500, 'the crash must come'. The book is a *catena* of illustrations from all over Europe, presented in Coulton's inimitable style. The chapters on Ambrose Traversari and Johann Busch, both of them 'visitors' of monasteries, are most illuminating and the situation in England is recorded with a wealth of documentary evidence that completely gives the lie to William Cobbett and others like him. There are slips which Coulton no doubt would have corrected. Rushbrook Williams (surely too slight an adversary for all Coulton's broadsides!) appears variously as Rushbrook, Rushbrooke and Rushmore (p. 790). There is a certain amount of repetition (e.g. pp. 241 and 313, 254 note, and 304 note), and a well-known remark of Horace is on p. 355 attributed to Juvenal. There are also some typographical errors, but the book is a fine production of the Cambridge Press and worthily concludes the life-work of a great scholar and humanist.

A. VICTOR MURRAY

*Here I Stand, A Life of Martin Luther*, by Roland Bainton. (Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, via The Epworth Press, \$4.75.)

This is likely to be the standard biography of Martin Luther for many years. The book is alive from beginning to end and leaves one with a vivid impression of this tremendous personality. Lovers of Luther will be delighted with it, and the more so because no attempt is made either to cover his weaknesses and mistakes or to reduce the stature of his friends or enemies. The language is non-technical and yet a clear picture is given of the issues at stake in the various discussions. Luther's constructive work is presented with as great care as his critical work. We are introduced to Luther as Church-Reformer, as teacher and preacher, as translator of the Bible, and as husband and father and friend. It is good to see the *pecca fortiter* saying interpreted as 'a piece of uproarious chaffing of the anaemic Melanchthon who was in a dither over scruples of conscience' and to read that the 'epitome of Luther's ethic is that a Christian must be a Christ to his neighbour'. The binding, type, and paper of the book are of a high standard and over a hundred woodcuts from the time of the Reformation add considerably to its interest. There is a very considerable bibliography, which includes references to the contributions of Philip Watson and Gordon Rupp to recent *Lutherana*. This rather costly book should find a place in all public libraries.

PERCY SCOTT

*Basic Christian Ethics*, by Paul Ramsey. (Charles Scribners' Sons, 21s.)

This is the most refreshing and illuminating study of the subject I have ever read. Instead of copying the pattern of the secular textbooks of ethics, Dr. Ramsey starts from the Christian centre and keeps himself tethered to it. He faces questions of exegesis and practical application with fearlessness and fairness, never adjusting a text to a theory or a command to our weakness. In the matter of sources, comparisons, and criticisms, he draws on a wide range of learning, always using it, never exhibiting it. He lights up nearly every page with new insight or puts an old truth in a new way. He conceals neither the graciousness nor the inexorableness of love. And to the end he carries his great theme with a singular verve and freshness. 'St. Paul's hymn in praise of love he did not so much think up as copy down' is an example of his saying big things simply yet without loss. For all its lightness of style the book is a treatise, an original investigation controlled by scholarly standards. The average young student will find it too long and detailed. Some of the more intellectual students may be put off by the easy style, missing the severe discipline behind it. The theological basis of Christian ethics is always kept in view. Which of the Gospel commands are separable, and which are not, from the expectation of an early *parousia*, is critically considered, the validity of those that are not being nevertheless maintained. The 'hard' sayings are upheld: e.g. non-resistance to evil, but while Dr. Ramsey holds that Love requires its acceptance for oneself, he thinks that love is not quietistic when the interests of others are concerned. This dualism of reference is brought to bear on the problem of faith *versus* works: the works ruled out are those that are done for one's own salvation, those that are done for the needs of others being demanded. How Christian love can be preferential, and how in vocational duty it can, consistently with an unclaiming self, require care for self, is worked out with sense and sensibility. All the issues are handled with as quick a sense of practice as of theory. I hope that this book will get the wide attention it deserves. I at least am deeply grateful for it.

T. E. JESSOP

*Scientific and Religious Knowledge*, by Gertrude E. Quinton. (S.C.M., 8s. 6d.)

This book was written in consequence of the author's experience in teaching sixth-form boys and girls, and meeting their questions about the validity of religious

knowledge in a scientific age. It could very well serve as text-book for a whole term's study of all the issues raised in the minds of intelligent young people. Club leaders, for example, would find much useful guidance for their discussion groups on this subject. Five chapters describe the scope and the limitations of the inductive method which the physical scientist uses. But the farther we move from the physical, the harder it is to speak of immutable laws. Higher levels of existence reveal their own laws, without contradicting the lower. God does not set aside what He Himself has created and ever sustains, but in His Personal Activity, supreme in the work of His Incarnate Son as the climax of history, a truly 'supernatural' order is being revealed. The awareness of this, in faith, is the highest knowledge. If criticism has to be made of a sincere and competent book, it would be that men like Waddington have left behind much of the scientific position, as outlined here, and his are the views now affecting young people. Had her book been published in time, Miss Quinton would have wished to add to the *Bibliography, Science, History, and Faith*, by Alan Richardson, to whose earlier work she acknowledges a ready debt.

T. J. FOINETTE

*Psychotherapy and a Christian View of Man*, by David E. Roberts. (Charles Scribners' Sons, 15s.)

Dr. Roberts, the Associate Professor of the Philosophy of Religion and Systematic Theology at Union Theological Seminary, New York, has written a most readable and well-informed treatise on a most important subject. Today it is admitted that psychology and pastoral theology are complementary. Dr. Roberts is an authority in both fields and in addition he writes in such a way that any intelligent layman is interested from first to last. To the reviewer the weakest point in the book is that the author has not very clearly shown how psychotherapy and religion do dovetail into one another. This, of course, is an enormous subject, in view of the many schools in current psychotherapy, but even within his chosen limits Dr. Roberts would have done a more effective piece of work if the major contributions to psychiatry and psychotherapy had been discussed in the light of the important beliefs of the Christian religion. A hostile critic might even say that in this volume there is one book on psychology and another on religion. The last chapter is, to my mind, the most effective. The inner conflict of man which concerns the psychotherapist so closely is very relevant to the doctrine of sin, and the psychologist's view of integration is in turn very relevant to the Church's ministry of healing and the doctrine of grace. I entirely agree when Dr. Roberts writes: 'Ultimately psychiatry cannot understand its own task aright except within the framework of a Christian view of man and God.' This book will help ministers in handling the difficulties of people who seek their aid.

LESLIE D. WEATHERHEAD

*The Furtherance of the Gospel*, by R. W. Moore.

*The Truth of the Gospel*, by G. B. Caird. (Oxford University Press, 6s. each. School edition, 5s.)

These books form Parts 2 and 3 of *A Primer of Christianity*. Both of them are very suitable for the purpose for which they are intended—for use in the upper forms of schools. They would also be valuable for private reading. Mr. Moore tells the story of Christian history from the Acts of the Apostles to the present day. He writes with clarity and simplicity, yet without shallowness. There are accounts of the early heresies which are more understandable than many others; the writer seeks to do justice to the Christendom of the Middle Ages, in which he is evidently at home. Perhaps he gives too large a space to this period, in proportion to the size of the book, for in other places he has to compress unduly. He has drawn his facts from a wide circle and there is a useful list of recommended books at the end. There are some



rather serious omissions. In the seventeenth century there are only a couple of passing references to the Congregationalists and Baptists. The Quakers and Methodists are dealt with more adequately—but only eighteenth-century Methodism. There is considerable confusion over the Puritans, Nonconformists, and Dissenters. The distinction between these is not at all clear, and there is a remarkable contrast made on p. 105 between 'Anglican clergy' and 'Protestants'. The book needs supplementing by the teacher, but it is a useful outline. In Prof. Caird's discussion of the Christian faith and the Christian life his treatment is in refreshing contrast to some books of a similar nature, which seem to assume their readers are trained philosophers or budding theologians. Here also there is clarity and simplicity, as well as some frank speaking—e.g. about some Old Testament miracles and about the virgin birth. Yet the author does not talk down to his readers; there is nothing condescending about his book. The historical basis of Christianity is affirmed, although the arguments drawn from some passages in the Gospels are surprisingly weak and uncritical, especially coming from a Professor of the New Testament. The reference at the foot of p. 104 should be Mark 6<sup>a</sup>.

H. A. GUY

*Teaching the Bible to Juniors. Teaching the Bible to Seniors*, by H. Trevor Hughes. (Newnes Educational Publishing Co., 6s. each.)

Both these books are excellent and there are few teachers who would not be able to gain something from studying them. Each has introductory sections which discuss the position of the teaching in relation to the child and give a clear view of the background of the Gospels and the land of Palestine. Then follows, in the Junior volume, a section on the story told in the Bible, both Old Testament and New Testament, and chapters on the Christian life and worship. The Senior volume has the Old Testament account of the Jewish history and the life of Jesus in the Gospels, with matter from the Acts of the Apostles. In each case the presentation is clear and straightforward, although a little conservative in places. There are two maps in each, which are models of clarity, both in what they include and in what they leave out. These books could well be used with any Scripture syllabus, in day- or Sunday-school.

H. A. GUY

*Methodist Journey*, by Shirley Redfern. (The Epworth Press, 5s.)

*My Great Redeemer's Praise*, by H. G. Tunncliff. (The Epworth Press, 7s. 6d.)

*The Quiet Way*: Selections from letters of Tersteegen, by Emily Chisholm. (The Epworth Press, 4s. 6d.)

*Spiritual Discipline*, by C. J. Rae. (Independent Press, 5s.)

In *Methodist Journey* Mr. Redfern has rendered a service to the people called Methodists by a simple and sincere account of the ordinary life of the Church. In these days of strain it is good to know that there have been men and women of kindly and adventurous faith, and that their number has not yet failed. This is a book full of homely charm and tender belief.

The next two books belong to the new series of 'Epworth Devotional Books', which are excellent both in substance and format. Mr. Tunncliff has planned his volume with only one idea in mind, 'the Love of Jesus'. The praise of the Holy Catholic Church throughout the world and the centuries is here representatively collected to feed the spirit and 'warm the heart'. Miss Chisholm has rendered us another kind of service by reminding us that the need of the spirit is the same in all ages. Out of an eighteenth-century Germany, 'war-ridden and morally and spiritually impoverished', her extracts from the letters of the ribbon-weaver Gerhart Tersteegen come with special impact today. This book bears the hallmark of a most holy Faith.

The fourth book is the record of a fruitful pastoral ministry. It includes a series of faithful dealings with souls of this generation arranged as daily readings. Mr. Rae describes in his own language the help and consolation given to those who come to him. He gives much sound direction, and does not hesitate to expose weakness and sin. This astringent, restorative, and prayerful volume will bring new hope to the troubled, and fresh impetus to the believer.

C. LESLIE BREWER

## From My New Shelf<sup>1</sup>

BY C. RYDER SMITH

*Baptism in the New Testament*, by Oscar Cullmann. (S.C.M., paper, 6s.) This is the first of a new series of 'studies in biblical theology'. Like Barth the writer starts from Romans 6<sup>1st</sup> and proceeds exegetically, but he reaches different conclusions. The chief of these is that 'Christ in his death and resurrection procures for all men and independent of them a *general Baptism*'—and 'all men' includes infants. There is no room here to examine the argument but it is very carefully pursued and for all who are interested in the present discussion of the doctrine of Baptism this thorough little book is indispensable. There is also an appendix which suggests that in Acts 8<sup>36</sup> and elsewhere *kōluein* is beginning to be a liturgical word.

*The Catholicity of Protestantism*, edited by R. Newton Flew and Rupert E. Davies. (Lutterworth Press, 5s.) The occasion of this 'report' was a request from the Archbishop of Canterbury that a group of Free Church theologians should answer certain crucial questions about reunion in England. The group finds that the difficulties run up into the doctrine of authority, and that South India shows the way forward. But much of their booklet is an answer to the account of Protestantism given in *Catholicity*, the report of a parallel Anglo-Catholic group. In the main their answer is a very able exposition of Luther's true teaching. This is more than timely.

*Problems of Reunion*, by A. E. J. Rawlinson. (Eyre & Spottiswoode, 9s.) In this book the Bishop of Derby has expanded a charge given to his Clergy and Churchwardens into six chapters and added reprints of four papers, all on subjects relevant to Reunion. He gives an expert's account of the historical evidence with special emphasis on the New Testament. He deals with Bishop Kirk's *Apostolic Ministry* with quiet trenchancy. He holds that it is not possible to be 'in a state of salvation' without Baptism. He is a specialist on 'South India', and he thinks that at present there is no prospect for progress toward reunion except on its general pattern, the Orthodox Church being fundamentally as intransigent as the Roman. I am sorry that he speaks of 'actual fact' and 'minimal essentials', but here is a scholar's account of the exact facts on all the chief subjects in debate.

*No Faith of My Own*, by J. V. Langmead Casserley. (Longmans Green & Co., 9s. 6d., paper 6s. 6d.) Dr. Casserley was born in a Rationalist home, but became a Christian. In this book he seeks to do two things—to show what Christianity is, and to demonstrate its superiority over the rivals that are now 'in the air'. He includes politics. He is an Anglican, but, except for a very few pages on episcopacy and the Lord's Supper, there is nothing to baulk a Free Churchman. He emphasizes grace rather than faith (in its 'subjective' sense) and the Incarnation rather than the Atonement. His book

<sup>1</sup> Owing to lack of space it has only been possible to give quite short reviews of important books.

is meant for ordinary folk, but in parts it demands that they should take the trouble to think. The book's name hardly describes it.

*Roman Catholicism*, by Thomas Corbishley. (Hutchinson, 7s. 6d.) This book, like others in the publisher's University Library, is explanatory and simple. It includes chapters on such subjects as 'Roman Catholicism and Progress' as well as on theology, etc. It is so persuasive that only well-informed Protestants should read it!

*Tomorrow's Church*, by S. M. Gibberd. (S.P.C.K., paper covers, 6s. 6d.) This thorough and well-integrated book, written 'with special reference to evangelism', is meant for Anglicans and might have been called 'The Parish and the Child', but, *mutatis mutandis*, it would be of great service to any local church that seriously sets itself to do its whole duty to children. A long chapter gives a lucid account of 'the new situation' created by the Education Act of 1944. Twelve other chapters range from theology to worship and from worship to clubs.

*Basic Issues in Christian Thought*, by Albert C. Knudson, (Abingdon-Cokesbury Press via The Epworth Press, \$2.75.) The jacket lists the 'basic issues' under the questions: 'Is faith reasonable?', 'Is God personal?', 'Are we truly free?', 'Why does evil exist?', 'How is God in Christ?', 'How does God work in us?', 'What is goodness?' Dr. Knudson is a Personalist after the manner of Bowne, a Methodist philosopher neglected in England. As the writer proceeds he faces his enemies, notably the Barthians. One asks a question or two. For instance, is 'the witness of the Spirit' a 'figure suggested by court practice'? But the book is a lucid and very serviceable exposition of the answers that the philosophic Evangelical of the Arminian branch gives to the problems of the faith that press most today.

*Science, History and Faith*, by Alan Richardson. (Oxford Press, 6s. 6d.; school edition, 5s.) As the wrapper says, in this book Canon Richardson seeks to help young people and others who 'are willing to think for themselves about the Christian faith'. His purpose is not so much to meet difficulties as to elucidate truth. Broadly speaking, he says first 'Consider the world', then 'Consider the Church', then 'Consider the New Testament', and so 'Consider Christ'. When he speaks of the novelty of the word *agape*, he forgets LXX, and he ought surely to have said that in the New Testament normal baptism is adult baptism. Again, 'there is no such thing as individual salvation' is only part of the truth, the other part being that there is nothing else! But Canon Richardson knows as few do how to mint academic gold and turn it into current coin. His book does just what he set out to do, and it is apt to an urgent need.

*Reason in Religion*, by W. R. Matthews. (Lindsey Press, 1s. 6d.) The Barthians and others appeal to 'revelation' against 'reason'. In the Essex Hall Lecture for 1950 the Dean of St. Paul's briefly but lucidly discriminates between what is true and what is false in this claim. This booklet is 'just what we were wanting'.

*The Person and Work of Christ*, by Benjamin Breckinridge Warfield. (Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, Philadelphia, \$4.50.) The works of the famous Princeton exponent of Calvinism have long been out of print. This volume contains fourteen of his 'Christological studies', with three sermons and a portrait.

*Christian Aspects of Evolution*, by P. T. Forsyth. (The Epworth Press, 1s. 6d.) This paper first appeared in *The London Quarterly Review* in 1905.

*The Christian Perspective*, by Edward T. Ramsdell. (Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, via The Epworth Press, \$2.50.) Prof. Ramsdell sets himself to harmonize the new Biblical Theology (e.g. in Kierkegaard) with what is true in philosophy (e.g. in Kant), his emphasis being on the former.

*The English Inheritance*, by G. Kitson Clark. (S.C.M., 15s.) In this well-documented 'historical essay' (of 181 pages) Mr. Clark 'selects certain points at which the Christian religion has intersected the history of the nation and

helped to mould the national heritage', mainly in the last three hundred years. He shows 'the close connexion in the history of England between the history of freedom and the history of religion', both Anglican and Nonconformist. His chapter on 'the Fluid Society' of the nineteenth century is specially good. The danger today is that 'the Welfare State' should become 'the Police State', and Mr. Clark suggests that only religion can prevent this. He knows all the ground; he uses unhackneyed but apt illustrations, not least from sermons; he shies away from generalizations and simplifications; and he has a way of showing that a familiar fact has an unfamiliar aspect. His punctuation is peculiar. This is the best book I have read on its theme, not least because Mr. Clark prefers to claim too little rather than too much.

*Gambling in English Life*, by E. Benson Perkins. (The Epworth Press, 6s.) Mr. Benson Perkins knows more about gambling than any other English Christian. In his Beckly Lecture he deals with every side of it—e.g. its insidious social corrosion, the tangle of the laws about it, and the differences among Christians about the nature of its sin. On the last he could have done with more space (and the date of Juvenal is wrongly given). He exposes the machinations of the gambling trade, showing how, when one of the limbs of this octopus is lopped, it sprouts another. Some tentacle has some hold on one in every two of us! Throughout, Mr. Perkins stands firm on the essential sinfulness of this selfish habit.

*In Search of Unity*, edited by Denis E. Taylor. (The Epworth Press, 6s.) In this book eleven writers provide 'brief outline studies' for Christian youth in Britain to equip them to do their part in 'building again the unity of the Body of Christ'. There are eight chapters on the teachings of non-Roman Churches, and five on broader subjects. It emerges that there are only two doctrines peculiar to a single Church, but very much of what the editor unhappily calls 'tremendous common ground'. The writers all know their business.

*The Spirit of Unity*, by the Abbot of Downside and others. (Blackfriars, Oxford, 3s. 6d.) In this small book eight Roman Catholic scholars write papers bearing, more or less closely, on reunion. Apart from a phrase or so, two—on Science and Religion and on Mystical Experience—might have been written by Protestants. In others—for instance, in the paper on work overseas—the writers admit that their own Church has made mistakes. Credit is given alike to the Eastern, Anglican, and Free Churches for some things. For instance, there is an exposition and appreciation of Wesley's sermon on 'The Witness of the Spirit' (though, by a misprint, 'not' is omitted in one quotation). Of course there is an honest '*non possumus*' on some great issues, notably in a very able paper on 'The Unity of the Church' which only an expert could answer. But, as on the other side, there is a new temper. The writers no longer say peremptorily 'You are heretics! Repent and return!', but: 'You are our "separated brethren"'. Let us try to understand one another, telling the whole truth in love.' And there is an *imprimatur*.

Prof. Norman Sykes's Stumpff Lecture on *Daniel Ernst Jablonski and the Church of England* (S.P.C.K., 2s.) is a careful and scholarly account of an eighteenth-century attempt to unite the Lutheran and Reformed Churches on an Anglican basis.

*A Shorter Service Book of the Christian Faith*, compiled by G. W. Briggs. (Oxford Press, 2s. 6d.) Canon Briggs drew up this handy pocket-volume for use in the Air Training Corps, but it will be a help to any Christian or group of Christians whose worship must be brief. The first third of the book is liturgical, notably including a series of the 'prayers of famous men and women'. In the other two-thirds, beside eleven Psalms, there are 121 hymns from many sources. Tunes are suggested in an index.

*Companion to the School Hymn-book of the Methodist Church*, by W. S. Kelynack. (The Epworth Press, 21s.) Hard on the heels of this new hymn-book comes its *vade-mecum*. The first (and larger) part deals with the writers and the second with the hymns

themselves. Mr. Kelynack has done his work with patience and skill. The price may seem high, but this book will serve as long as the hymn-book lasts. A good book to give to a Minister or Superintendent or such-like.

*The Lion and the Lamb*, by Gerald Kennedy. (Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, via The Epworth Press, \$2.50.) Dr. Kennedy, a Methodist Bishop, holds that 'the Gospel sees truth in personal terms, which means that there is in it a large element of paradox'. So he preaches twenty-one pithy sermons under such titles as 'Sin and Grace', 'The Mind and the Heart', 'Tension and Peace', with an epilogue on 'All the Fullness'.

*Immortal Longings*, Sermons by G. T. Bellhouse. (The Epworth Press, 6s.) These twenty-one sermons are short (some six pages each); they expound the Bible; they apply its lessons to daily life; they are full of up-to-date illustrations; and they glow with the Gospel.

*Forward in Faith*, by Geoffrey Joycey. (The Epworth Press, 3s. 6d.) This is a sequel to *Venturing with Youth*. It is intended to stimulate 'discussion and fellowship' in groups, and deals conversationally with such subjects as 'Is there a God?', Sin, Prayer, the Christian Way of Life, and the Church. It is simple but not shallow, and the writer knows how to illustrate a theme. There are helps to the conduct of 'informal' meetings.

*The Secret of Mow Cop*, by William E. Farndale. (The Epworth Press, 3s.) In this Wesley Historical Lecture Dr. Farndale makes 'a new appraisal of Primitive Methodist origins'. It is what Wesley would have called 'a Plain Account'. The facts speak for themselves. But it is 'new' because it shows that on Mow Cop, as elsewhere, there was more praying than preaching. Any 'moral' for today?

*Asking them Questions*, third series, edited by Ronald Selby Wright. (Oxford Press, 7s. 6d.) *Ask Margaret Harwood*. (The Epworth Press, 6s.) These two books are alike, yet different. Mr. Wright has distributed his questions to seventeen ministers, ten 'leading laymen', and one woman. On the other hand, for more than twenty years 'Margaret Harwood' has herself had a batch of letters every post-day. Mr. Wright's questions come from young people, who want to know 'Who is God?' and 'What is the Atonement about?', and so on. Most of 'Margaret Harwood's' correspondents are older women (and men) who want answers to 'family problems'. As she is answering personal letters, her book is more intimate and warmer. But, of course, some questions appear in both these helpful and able books.

*Selections from the Prose of Dora Greenwell*, compiled by W. G. Hanson. (The Epworth Press, 3s.) In the literature of devotion Dora Greenwell is a *minor* classic, but a *classic*. Mr. Hanson, after a biographical introduction, selects and arranges passages from her three chief devotional books. One of the marks, both of her literary style and Christian experience, is quiet strength.

*My Cathedral, a Vision of Friendship*, by Alexander Irvine, 3rd edition. (Carter Publications, Belfast, 6s.) This is a fantasia, but a fantasia of *fact*. The Ulster-American author, sitting in the undestroyed cathedral at Amiens in the First War, used to dream that its nave and chapels and so on were thronged with his hosts of friends and acquaintances. The 'Great Light' of Christ shone for altar. As a boy, Dr. Irvine sold newspapers in the streets. In his skilful hands his daring method succeeds, for he is deft with a vivid picture.

*The Genius of Europe*, by Havelock Ellis. (Williams and Norgate, 12s. 6d.) When Havelock Ellis died in 1939 he left this book almost ready for the press. It is a reprint with a difference. Of the six longer essays five, written between 1916 and 1925, are on the 'genius' of England, Russia, France, Spain, and Germany. The essay on Russia, as 're-written', is now first printed, as is the 'reshaped' essay on Spain. The author claims that the essays describe traits that have persisted for



centuries. Then there are some twenty pages of quite new work, including a Foreword named 'My Credo', which is largely autobiographical. Havelock Ellis summed his philosophy in the phrase 'the harmonious conflict of opposites'.

*Rumi, Poet and Mystic (A.D. 1207-73)*, by Reynold A. Nicholson. (Geo. Allen and Unwin. 8s. 6d.) In this volume the late Prof. Nicholson has translated 119 of the poems of the great Persian Sufi, adding all necessary apparatus.

*Nicholas Ferrar, Junior*, by C. Leslie Craig. (The Epworth Press, 6s.) This 'linguist of Little Gidding', who died at twenty-one, was the nephew, namesake, and disciple of the founder of the famous community. Mr. Craig has gathered together all that is known of this maker of beautiful books. He has unearthed a volume in which young Ferrar wrote out the Fourth Gospel using a different language for each chapter—with one language to spare!

In the Society for Old Testament Study's *Book List, 1950* (4s. 6d.), experts review some two hundred recent volumes, English and foreign. Copies may be obtained from the Rev. Prof. G. Henton Davies, 3 The Dell, Westbury-on-Trym, Bristol.

*Fruits of Faith*, edited by J. Richard Spann. (Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, via The Epworth Press, \$2.50.) At the thirtieth Evanston Conference on Ministerial Training eighteen lecturers, most of them university teachers, were asked to deal with 'various aspects' of the 'basic theme' named in the title of this book. The lectures have been revised for publication. The first chapter is on 'A Living God' and the last on 'Christian Citizens'. Some chapters—e.g. those on Christ and the Atonement—deal with the Faith rather than 'fruits', but all exemplify *applied* theology. One third of the book is given to 'Fruits in Society'.

*Gospel Gleanings*, by Thomas Nicklin. (Longmans Green & Co., 21s.) In this book there are arguments which it is difficult to take seriously. On p. 74, for instance, we are informed that one argument for the common authorship of the Fourth Gospel and the Apocalypse is the fact that 'the Gospel notes that the whole house was filled with the odour of (Mary's) ointment and also makes Martha say of Lazarus's corpse, "Behold, he stinketh"!—while the Apocalypse speaks of the saints' prayers as a bowl full of odours!' Our author decides that all three Synoptic Gospels were written before A.D. 60, and that Luke was dependent for much of his material on the author of the Fourth Gospel. Again, St. John is said to have been the son of Mary Salome, and Judas Iscariot of Simon the Pharisee, while the rich young ruler is Saul of Tarsus, and so on. Indeed, everybody tends to become somebody else. Meanwhile, the findings of great scholars are either left without mention or dismissed with cool contempt. Mr. Nicklin has, however, studied the Gospels for himself for many years, and every now and again we are surprised by flashes of insight.

*Albert Schweitzer, a Vindication*, by George Seaver. (James Clarke & Co., 6s.) It is agreed that Albert Schweitzer is a great organist, a great New Testament scholar, a great missionary, and a great Christian. Is he also a great theologian and a great philosopher? Mr. Middleton Murry, among others, replies 'No', and two years ago he wrote a book entitled *The Challenge of Schweitzer* to say why. Within four or five months Dr. Seaver, Schweitzer's well-known disciple, had 'a reply' ready in which he counters Mr. Murry's chapters one by one, but it has only now been possible to print it.

*There's No Place Like Home*, by Rita F. Snowden. (The Epworth Press, 6s.) More than a quarter of a million copies of Miss Snowden's earlier books have been sold. Here are some forty more of her homely *causeries* (with six pictures). Each of the forty is like a cup of tea.

## PAMPHLETS AND BOOKLETS

- Ivory Tales*, by Donald S. Ching (The Epworth Press, 6s.). 'Fiction, fable, and fact', from French West Africa.
- Fanyana the Brave*, by Fay King (The Epworth Press, 5s.). 'A tale of life and adventure in Zululand.'
- Children as Citizens*, by Margery Fry (National Children's Home, Highbury Park, N.5., 3s. 6d.). The Children's Home 'Convocation Lecture' for 1950.
- Plan Overboard*, by Frederick H. Wiseman (Independent Press, 3s. 6d.). A Speedwell Play 'in a Prologue and two Acts'.
- A Pocketful of Rhymes*, by Helen Diana Clyde (The Epworth Press, 2s. 6d.). Some four dozen sets of verses for children, with many antic pictures.
- Christianity for Adults*, by T. E. Jessop (The Epworth Press, 6d.).
- Christian Mental Efficiency*, by Wilfrid H. Bourne (The Epworth Press, 6d.).
- Who Joins the Glorious Host?*, by John Lawson (The Epworth Press, 3s.). A 'Handbook for Methodist Church Membership Classes', etc., based on the Creed and the Communion.
- Today I go to Communion*, by John Lawson (The Epworth Press, 9d.). For new Church members.
- Before You Go Home*, compiled by Christopher Ross (The Epworth Press, 2s. 6d.). 'Twenty-one Epilogues to End your Programme.' Tested in a Lancashire Church.
- The Bible and Polygamy*, by Geoffrey Parrinder (S.P.C.K., 2s. 6d.).

## NOTABLE ARTICLES IN PERIODICALS

- The Hibbert Journal*, October (Allen and Unwin, 3s. 6d.).
- Religion and the Rise of Western Culture, by Arnold Toynbee.
- New Hebrew Scrolls, by G. R. Driver.
- The Reformation (its Importance Now), by H. L. Stewart.
- Man without Mind? (Logical Behaviourism), by F. H. Heinemann.
- The Journal of Religion*, July (University of Chicago Press, via Cambridge Press, \$1.85).
- The Vision of History in the New Testament, by Theo. Preiss.
- The Conception of History in the Christian Tradition, by Jean Daniélou.
- Symposium on Religious Education: Articles by Ross Snyder, Nevin Harner, Wesner Fallaw, and Bernard E. Meland.
- Theology Today*, July (Princeton, via B. H. Blackwell, Oxford, 3s. 6d.).
- The Simple Gospel, a Plea to Theologians, by Walter Lowrie.
- Call to Discipleship, by John A. Mackay.
- T. S. Eliot's Quest for Certitude (*re The Cocktail Party*), by Wilbur Dwight Dunkel.
- The Harvard Theological Review*, July (Harvard Theological Press, via Oxford Press, \$3.00 a year).
- The Problem of Theophilus, by Robert M. Grant.
- The Seventeenth Century Doctrine of Plastic Nature, by William B. Hunter, Jun.
- The 'Reverent Agnosticism' of Karl Barth, by H. L. Stewart.
- The International Review of Missions*, October (Oxford Press, 3s. 6d.).
- The Missionary Obligation (Today), by A. G. Hebert and M. A. C. Warren.
- Christian Vocation and the Missionary Call, by Charles Long, Jun.
- The Training of Christian Church Leaders in India, by V. Jothipakiam.
- The Expository Times*, September (T. and T. Clark, 1s. 3d.).
- St. Paul in the Twentieth Century, by A. M. Hunter.
- Is there a Theology of the Old Testament?, by A. S. Herbert.
- Ultimate Aims, by Thomas Shearer.
- do.*, October.
- Prophet and Priest in Israel, by N. W. Porteous.
- Comparative Religion and Evangelism, by W. S. Urquhart.
- 'Love' and 'Righteousness', a Study of the Influence of Christianity on Language, by E. Kenneth Lee.
- do.*, November.
- Divine Kingship and the Old Testament, by A. R. Johnson.
- The Apostolic Kerugma in Philippians 2<sup>o</sup>-9, by B. W. Horan.
- Bulletin of Rylands Library*, September (Manchester University Press, 7s. 6d.)
- Aldus Manutius, the Scholar-Printer, 1450-1515, by Edward Robertson.
- The Meaning of Sacrifice in the Old Testament, by Harold H. Rowley.
- Some Letters of St. Augustine (to St. Jerome), by W. H. Semple.

# Our Contributors

NORMAN ADCOCK

Anglican Minister. Educated at Mercers' School, Holborn. Nephew of the late Arthur St. John Adcock, author, critic, and poet, who was for many years Editor of 'The Bookman', and cousin of the late Marion St. John Webb, many of whose well-known stories and poems for children have recently been re-published. Main interests: Children's stories, theology, philosophy, and archaeology. Entered King's College, London, Theological Faculty, in January 1946, and obtained his Associate of King's College Diploma in 1949. Ordained Advent 1950. Assistant Curate, St. Stephen's Church, Battersea, Diocese of Southwark. Contributor to various theological journals, etc. 'The Primacy of a Christian Philosophy' (*Church Quarterly Review*, January 1950).

C. EDWARD BARKER

Methodist Minister. Specialized in the study and practice of eclectic psychotherapy; and now doing full-time psychotherapeutic work, co-operating with medical men in the treatment of emotional, neurotic, and psychosomatic problems.

THOMAS H. CARTER  
L.R.A.M.

For some years Headmaster of Pickering School (Yorks.). Contributor to *Musical Opinion*, etc. This Article was written shortly before his death in 1949.

D. R. DAVIES

Rector of St. Mary Magdalen, St. Leonards-on-Sea, since October 1949. Author of *On To Orthodoxy*, *Down Peacock's Feathers*, and other books, the latest of which is a volume of Sermons, *Thirty Minutes To Raise The Dead*.

G. H. FINDLAY  
M.A. (LEEDS)

Methodist Minister. For twelve years missionary in India, and for six years with the Indians in Fiji. Previously contributed on similar subjects.

J. ARTHUR HOYLES

Methodist Minister. Superintendent of the Paisley Central Mission. Member of the Methodist Prison Committee. Writer of Articles on Juvenile Delinquency.

NORMAN W. MUMFORD  
M.A. (OXON.)  
B.A. (CANTAB.)

Methodist Minister. Member of the Committee on Law and Polity, and the Ministerial Training Committee of the Methodist Church.

RICHARD PYKE

Methodist Minister. Recently retired from the Bursarship of Edgehill Girls' College. President: United Methodist Conference, 1927; Methodist Conference, 1939. Author of several books, including *Men and Memories*.

'BENJAMIN RICHARDS'

Pseudonym used by the Rev. R. B. Preece. Formerly Methodist Minister, is now the Anglican Rector of a Somerset village near Taunton. Previous contributions January 1945 and January 1946 issues. Also contributor to *Hibbert Journal*, *World Digest*, *Chambers's Journal*, Church press, etc. Secretary of the Taunton Clerical Society; Governor of Huish's Grammar School. Advocate of Christian Re-Union.

C. RYDER SMITH  
B.A., D.D.

Principal, Richmond College, London University, 1929-40. Professor in Theology, 1932-40. President Methodist Church, 1931. Author of many theological books.

WILLIAM WARREN SWEET  
Ph.D.

Dean of the Faculty, Perkins School of Theology, Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas, U.S.A. Author of *The American Church* (Beckly Lecture, 1946), *Methodism in American History*, etc.

CARTWRIGHT TIMMS

Fellow of the Royal Entomological Society and member of many other scientific societies. Author of many articles, short stories, and poems; lecturer and broadcaster.

HENRY PITNEY  
VAN DUSEN

President: Union Theological Seminary, New York City. Presbyterian Minister (1924). Instructor in Systematic Theology and Philosophy of Religion, Union Theological Seminary (1926-7); Assistant Professor (1927-31); Associate Professor (1931-6); Dean of Students (1932-9). Author of numerous works, including *Methodism's World Mission* (1940), *What is the Church doing?* (1943), and *They found the Church there* (1945).

Printed in Great Britain by  
The Camelot Press Ltd., London and Southampton

